

COPYRIGHT WARNING

Notice: warning concerning copyright restrictions

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specific conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be "used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research." If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of "fair use," that user may be liable for copyright infringement. This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

The Origin and Meaning
of the
Eucharistic Words in the New Testament
And Parallels in
Some Modern Liturgies

Senior Thesis
April 13, 1966
John Starr Greenman

Contents

Chapter I	The Origin and Meaning of the Eucharistic Words in the New Testament
Chapter II	The Earliest Setting of the Eucharist
Chapter III	The Meaning of the Eucharistic Words in some Modern Liturgies
Appendix I	Some Modern Orders of Worship

In recent decades, liturgical studies has joined hands with New Testament studies in a search to discover the origin and earliest meaning of the Eucharist. New Testament findings have been applied to modern liturgies in the hope of attaining some measure of the closeness to Our Lord and vitality of life and expression which characterized the Early Church.

Some problems have marred this research and caused pessimism as to the usefulness of the results. Very little is known about the earliest liturgical practices of the Pre-Pauline church. Furthermore the Gospels themselves are open to the charge of perpetrating liturgical formulae rather than the primitive tradition close to the original words of Jesus. Once this charge has been met, there is the problem of the influence of contemporaneous Jewish religious practices and groups and the influence of Hellenistic Christianity and the problem of the primitive liturgies themselves. Do they represent tendencies already present in the Gospels and Epistles or does the researcher fall into the trap of reading into the New Testament what he finds in the writings of the Early Fathers? Finally, there is a tangle of theological issues when liturgical renewal is discussed: what is the role of tradition and innovation, of Word and Sacrament, aesthetical appreciation and pragmatic consideration,

balance and imbalance, serenity and turbulence.

In spite of these difficulties, I am optimistic about the possibilities of liturgical renewal through New Testament studies. The New Testament is the treasury of Our Lord's life. Its treasure is never spent. And through its study, we learn the inner relationships between seemingly unrelated events. So it is with the liturgy which is the well-spring of the Church's devotion. Through the study of the liturgy we will find what is already there, but our New Testament studies will help us. One of the things we will, I think, discover through this joint study is the way in which to respond to the account of the Last Supper when it is rehearsed in the Words of Institution. Let us join our brethren of the Church of South India in their solemn gladness when they reply:

Amen. Thy death, O Lord, we commemorate,
thy resurrection we confess, and thy
second coming we wait. Glory be to
thee, O Christ.

Chapter One

The Origin and Meaning of the Eucharistic Words in the New Testament

We will take Mk. 14:22-24 as the pericope for exegesis because it is the simplest in form and vocabulary and because the other synoptic and Pauline variants seem either to be influenced by Mark directly or to know the same or similar tradition.

In examining the parallel Greek versions of the institution of the Lord's Supper, (Mt. 26:26-28, Mk. 14:22-24, Lk. 22:17-20 and I Cor. 11:23-25), it appears that the similarities among these texts are greater than the differences although each text has features characteristic of its author. In comparing Mark with Matthew, we find as would be expected a well established, common form and vocabulary which may be reconstructed as follows:

...As they were eating (he) took bread, and blessed, and broke it, and (gave) it to (them) and said, "take... this is my body."

And he took a cup (and) when he had given thanks he gave it to them, (and they) all (drank) of it. (And he said to them), "This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out (for) many... ."¹

ἐσθίωντων αὐτῶν λαβὼν ἄρτον
εὐλογησας ἔκλασεν καὶ εἶπεν
λάβετε τοῦτο ἐστί τὸ σῶμα μου
καὶ λαβὼν πετῆριον καὶ
εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ
εἶπεν ἕξ αὐτοῦ πάντες. καὶ
εἶπεν αὐτοῖς τοῦτο ἐστί τὸ
αἷμα μου τῆς διαθήκης τοῦ
ἐκχυννόμενου ὡς πολλῶν.

Mk 14:22-24

Mt. 26:26

-28

¹ Adapted from Huck-Lietzmann, Synopsis, 1936, p. 186.

This is the core of the tradition as it is preserved in both Mark and Matthew. The form and wording in this core are the same in both Mark and Matthew with a few exceptions. The form of the tradition is that of two narrative sentences which follow each other directly consisting of three parts: 1) a brief narrative setting (v. 22a) and further narrative details (vv. 23c, 24a) - "as they were eating," "and they drank," "and he said to them" - 2) Jesus' actions, and 3) Jesus' words accompanying the actions.

The initial setting serves to connect the Matthean and Markan pericopes with the Passion Narrative, (Mt. 26:21, 26; Mk. 14:18, 22). The opening clause is anticipated by the setting in Mk. 14:17-18 and parallels which is described in v. 12 as "the first day of Unleavened Bread, When they sacrificed the passover lamb." Discussion of the chronological problem of actual dating of the Last Supper will be reserved for Chapter two. But for our present purposes, it is sufficient to say that the Markan pericope under discussion is presented as an integral part of the Passion Narrative and linked to it by bits of narrative detail.

The description of Mt. 26:26a *ἐσθίουτων δε αὐτῶν* and Mk. 14:22a *καὶ ἐσθίουτων αὐτῶν* as "bits of narrative detail" implies that they are incidental to the text which follows. Perhaps they are in fact only

the cement which binds together diverse elements of tradition. One gains this impression from comparing Mk. 14:22a with its apparant duplicate, 14:18, *ἡ ἀνάκλησις τοῦ κυρίου*. For Mk. 14:22-24 and par. shows no reflection of the preparations recounted in vv. 12-16 or the announcement of the traitor vv. 17-21. Vv. 22-25 as well as the preceding sections seems to be a self contained unit. What of the narrative setting, then? It is either a bit of narrative mortar added by Mark as its duplication in Mk. 14:18 indicates. Or it is a special part of the words of institution. The latter is Jeremias' view. He points to Paul's similar setting in ICor 11:23a *ἐν τῇ κυρίῳ τῇ ἑσπέρῃ* and compares the Markan pericope with the Pauline account of the Last Supper. Mark uses the same three verbs as Paul, *ἁγάγετω* and *ἐκλάττω* (although Mark uses *εὐλογεῖ* instead of the Pauline *εὐχαριστεῖ*). This fact argues for a common tradition underlying both accounts. But Mark adds the fourth verb *ἐδοῦκεν αὐτοῖς* which, Jeremias thinks, implies the liturgical character of the Markan account, (possibly because it refers to an action of the leader toward the participants).¹ This liturgical tendency is even more pronounced in Matthew, says Jeremias. Matthew adds

¹ J. Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, 1955, p. 108.

ἀγενής and τοῖς ~~μαρτυροῦσι~~ in
26:26 making the introduction (setting) read "like a
new beginning, and the liturgical tone becomes even more
emphatic."¹ Furthermore, Matthew connects ἀββὴν
and εὐδοκίας by καὶ and
substitutes ὁσος for ἐσσηνέ. .
These changes subordinate the thanksgiving and the
distribution to the breaking of the bread, καὶ ἡ σῆμα τῶν
ἀποστόλων, "which has become the essential
feature of the first act."²

This analysis makes comparisons which are undoubtedly
important for our understanding of the Markan, Matthean, and
Pauline viewpoints. But it is one thing to point out the
comparisons and another thing to explain their meaning.
Jeremias explains their meaning by recourse to a form
critical device, the Pre-Markan liturgical (cultic)
formula. This may be a useful device. How else, for
instance are we to explain the fact that all four Gospels
contain substantially the same order of events in the
Passion Narrative from the Entry into Jerusalem to the
Empty Tomb? If all the Gospel writers knew substantially
the same Passion tradition, perhaps Jeremias is justified
in saying that they all knew the same tradition of the
Last Supper, (although this is questionable). Even if this

¹ Ibid.
² Ibid.

were so, we could not automatically assume that this Last Supper tradition was a liturgical formula conditioned by the worship of the early church. For Acts does not tell of any recollection of the Last Supper in "the breaking of the bread."

If the comparisons here noted are a matter of style, they may reveal more about their authors than they do about the primitive Eucharist. This possibility must be kept in mind. It is tempting to make the individual words bear the weight of a whole Eucharistic theology. And yet the New Testament accounts and their texts are all we have to go on; so that it is necessary to try to understand the shades of meaning which individual words imply. And finally, it is necessary to remember that classification of the words, (in this case a liturgical formula), does not exhaust their meaning or remove them from scrutiny.

The further narrative details, (Mk. 14:23c, 24a), are significant not only as narrative connectors but because the mood has changed in the Matthean version from the indicative to the imperative, (Mk 14:23c; Mt. 26:27c; Mk. 14:24a; Mt. 26:28); and from direct discourse "and they all drank of it," and phrase "and he said to them," to a direct command, "Drink of it..." which continues uninterrupted by further narrative detail. From these observations it appears that the

Matthean version makes the Markan syntax more complex. Matthew is generally apt to change Markan narrative into direct quotation; this is characteristic of the first Gospel.

Let us now consider Jesus' actions. These actions are expressed succinctly by the words: "took ... and having blessed ... broke and gave", (of the bread and similarly of the cup), "took ... and having given thanks, gave."

The Greek word *λάνθάνω*, "to take" is a common expression sometimes used redundantly to create a more lively narrative.¹ It is not difficult to find examples of the latter usage in the New Testament. Such usage frequently occurs in the passion narrative and in parables. Three parables, those of the mustard seed (Mt. 13:31 // Lk. 13:19); the leaven (Mt. 13:33 // Lk. 13:21), and the wise and foolish virgins, (Mt. 25:1-4) make use of *λάνθάνω*; Mt. 25:1-4 reiterates the word four times. But more significant for our purposes is the frequent use of this redundant word in the Passion Narrative. Here are some examples some of which show redundancy.

"... and (they) took the reed and struck him in the head"

Mt. 27:30

"When he had washed their feet and taken his garments..."
Jn. 13:12

¹

Bauer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, p. 465.

"Then Pilate took Jesus and scourged him."
Jn. 19:1

"... they took his garments and made four parts." ¹
Jn. 19:23

It is more than sufficient to say that they took a reed or took his garments before they did something else. Naturally one takes a reed before one strikes another and one takes another's garments before they are divided in four parts. The taking itself is superfluous, the action which follows is what is significant.

In certain New England regions one hears colloquial phrases such as, "I up and went" or "I took and baked a cake." In these cases it is the going and the baking which are the important actions, i.e. necessary to the plain sense of the sentence, but the colloquial additions enliven the narrative. It is more ~~colloquial~~ to say, "I took and baked a cake." than simply "I baked a cake," although the plain sense is preserved even when the verb "to take" is removed.

This colloquial coloration is perhaps part of the reason for Mark's use of *ἔλαβεν* in his account of the Last Supper. It is obvious that Jesus would have to have taken the bread before he could have

¹ Ibid., see also Mk. 15:23; Jn. 19:30. Other usages include general references, (Mk. 9:36, Mk. 7:27 // Mt. 15:26; Mt. 10:38) and specific references to the taking and breaking of bread, (Lk. 24:30; Ac. 9:19; 27:35) and even the taking of sacrificial animals, (Hb. 9:19-22).

broken it and taken the cup before he could have given it to them. Thus linguistically speaking, one might say he blessed and broke the bread and gave thanks and gave them the cup without destroying the meaning of the important actions. On the other hand, liturgically speaking, the taking has meaning in the rite of the P.E.C.U.S.A., and we cannot rule out the possibility that it also had meaning for the synoptic writers. In the American Prayer Book during the consecration prayer just before the words, "he took bread," the following rubric is inserted.

(a) here the Priest is to take the Paten into his hands. Similarly, the following rubric appears before the words, "he took the cup":

(d) here he is to take the Cup into his hands. It seems that this taking into the hands has a meaning of its own; a significant action is taking place by which the food is set aside, dedicated or blessed through the hands of the priest.¹ Let us note the preparatory function of taking. By it the food is prepared and by it the reader of Mark is prepared for what is to come.

¹ The sooner we get rid of the idea that the so-called "elements" are what is blessed the better. What we need is a recovery of the Hebrew meaning of blessing by which God is blessed and therefore the food is sanctified. According to Walter Lowrie, The Lord's Supper and the Liturgy, 1943, p. 7, the prayer of thanksgiving at the Last Supper was the same one used by Jesus at the feedings of the multitudes. Its purpose, then, was not to change the food but to make it holy as an efficacious sacrament.

See also Lowrie's suggestive remarks on the "priesthood of all believers" in the Eucharist, (p. 14).

Not so in the Words of Institution, Mk. 14:22-25 and par.: "Take, this is my body." For here the whole sense of the command is understood by the word "take". It is not merely a linguistic redundancy or a liturgical preparation but the whole action of receiving and eating. This may be why Matthew (26:26) adds the $\phi\alpha\chi\epsilon\tau\epsilon$, "eat." What is understood in Mark becomes explicit liturgically in Matthew.¹ It may be right to follow Jeremias' reasoning here that $\lambda\alpha\beta\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ "take," is original since it also appears in Luke. Perhaps as Jeremias says represents a real "formula of invitation ... used when the bread and the cup of blessing (at the Passover) were handed round."² But in any case it is doubtful that Matthew thought he was making a radical change in Mark by adding $\phi\alpha\chi\epsilon\tau\epsilon, \lambda\alpha\beta\epsilon\tau\epsilon$. Matthew was probably only spelling out what Mark had understood implicitly: that $\lambda\alpha\beta\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ expressed the whole command of what the disciples were to do with their Master's offering, receiving it and consuming it.

Having raised the question of the relation of the words "take" and "eat" in the Matthean text, let us take a closer look at the word $\epsilon\tau\eta\lambda\omega$. In general its meanings fall into three categories: of ordinary activities, with reference to the Passover, and of Jesus' meals with his

¹ Jeremias, op. cit., p. 109.
² Ibid.

disciples. In the Old Testament *אכל* is used in Joseph's dire prediction of the chief baker's fate in Gen. 40:19, "... the birds will eat the flesh from you."¹ A more common usage is found in Ex. 2:20 and in Ruth 2:14 in reference to ordinary meals. In the Gospels one finds Jesus quoting an Old Testament situation to justify plucking and eating grain on the sabbath. Jesus refers to David's eating of the bread of the presence (I Sam. 21:1-6; Lev. 24:9) an incident recorded in all three Gospels, (Mt. 12:4; Mk. 2:26; Lk. 6:4). This incident is part of Jesus' polemic against the ritual rigorism of the pharisees, (Mt. 15:2; Mk. 7:5f; Mk. 2:16 and parallels Lk. 14:1-6). Other references to Old Testament uses of *אכל* are found in Lk. 17:27; I Cor 10:7; 15:32. These passages refer to the carefree days of eating and drinking before the final judgment.² The mood of luxurious or even dissipated living before judgment is reflected in Jesus' parable of the Faithful and Wise servant, (Mt. 25:45-51), and The Parable of the Rich Fool, (Lk. 12:13-21). In the Parable of The Servant's Wages (Lk. 17:17-10), and the logion from Lk. 12:22 *אכל* also stands for ordinary eating.

The use of this word in reference to the Passover is naturally more restricted. It may be found in Old Testament accounts of the Passover (Ezra 6:21f; II Ch. 30:18f). We

¹ In the New Testament, Rev. 17:16; 19:18 refer to eating someone's flesh.

² See R. S. V. for original Old Testament passages.

have also mentioned the setting of the Passion Narrativeⁱ in Mk. 14 and par. especially vv. 12 and 14 in Mk. 12 which speak of "eating the Passover", (Jn. 18:28). The cry of one who sat at table with Jesus in Lk. 14:15 "Blessed is he who shall eat bread in the Kingdom of God!" certainly voices an eschatological expectation which is also a central theme at Passover. The word *εσθίω* as well as the act of eating itself has close associations with the Passover as with the Lord's Supper.

Outside the narratives of the Last Supper themselves there exist a number of passages which appear to have a close connection with the Supper. Mark's account of the Feeding of the 4,000 (8:1 // Mt. 15:36x) and the Feeding of the 5,000 (Mk. 6:41 and parallels) must have a close connection with the Last Supper accounts (also Lk. 24:30). The significant terminology is very close and will be examined in greater detail later on. Jn. 6:48-59 is a commentary on the supper and will also receive fuller treatment.¹ In Acts while there are frequent references to the breaking of bread, (2:42; 20:7, 11) Paul's meal on shipboard during the voyage to Rome, (Acts 27:35),

¹ Let it be said here that there can be no doubt that the Feeding of the Multitudes is a Eucharistic setting. John appreciates this fact when he precedes his Eucharistic commentary by his own account of the Feeding of the Multitude (Jn. 6:1-15). Lowrie, *op. cit.*, p. 4, affirms the close connection between the Eucharist and the Feedings by citing examples of primitive Christian art in which "the Eucharist is represented, not by a picture of Christ and his disciples seated at a table in the upper room, but by groups of Christians which by the presence of baskets of bread and the two fish are clearly associated with the multitude in the wilderness.

commands central interest.¹ I Cor. 10:16 should also be mentioned as a possible later development of the Words of Institution.

Two words describing the actions of Jesus at the Last Supper are close in meaning: *εὐλογεῖν* and *εὐχαριστεῖν* which follows *εὐχαριστησας* (Mk. 14:22 par.), is translated he "blessed" in the R.S.V.; whereas *εὐχαριστησας* is rendered "when he had given thanks" when it appears in the next verse after the taking of the cup. The question is how close are these words in meaning? Are they interchangeable or does one represent a more technical meaning than the other?²

¹ C. D. F. Moule, Worship in the New Testament, 1961, p. 27, declares that "it would be almost ludicrous" to suppose that Paul did something "sacramental." It is too bad that Professor Moule's concept of what is "sacramental" blinds him to the possibility that Paul's meal really was an early bread Eucharist, (such as, we shall see is examined by Cullmann). Lowrie, op. cit., p. 13 rightly comments; "This example of the Apostle must restrain us from denouncing absolutely any exception to common custom which is prompted and justified by circumstances."

² Lowrie, op. cit., p. 7 claims the two words are equivalent. The form of consecration which they imply is the same as that used by Jesus at the Feeding of the Multitudes and the Last Supper. It was and is consequently the whole prayer of thanksgiving which consecrated the food, (not any particular part of it, e.g. the memorial of the Passion, etc.). See C.W.F. Smith, "Action in the Liturgy," Dr. Lowrie of Princeton and Rome, ed. A. C. Zabriskie, 1957, p. 87.

But Jeremias, op. cit., p. 108 regards *εὐλογεῖν* as "normal for grace before meat" and *εὐχαριστεῖν* as a "gracifying" tendency. Actually Mark uses both words (Mk. 14:22, 23; 6:41; 8:6,7). And apparently he uses them interchangeably. It would be disastrous to make these words distinctive tags of different conceptions of the Eucharist.

In its primary meaning *εὐλογεῖν* means to "speak well, praise, extol" but also to "give thanks" or "to bless." The latter is perhaps the most significant for our purposes since it appears in the stories of the Feeding of the Five Thousand (Mk. 6:41; Mt. 14:19; Lk. 9:16) and the Feeding of the Four Thousand, (Mk. 8:1-10 but not Mt. 15:32-39).

καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς πεντε ἄρτους Mt. 14:19
καὶ σου ἰχθύας ἀναβλέψας εἰς Mk. 6:41
τοῦ οὐρανοῦ εὐλογήσεν... Lk. 9:16

ἐλάβεν τοὺς ἑπτὰ	... καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς
ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς	ἑπτὰ ἄρτους
ἰχθύας καὶ	εὐχαρίστησας...
εὐχαρίστησας.	καὶ εὐλογήσας
Mt. 15:36	αὐτὰ ἐπέεν καὶ
	ταῦτα πάλιν ἐβένδι.
	Mk. 8:6, 7.

The story of the Feeding of the Five Thousand contains

εὐλογεῖν once in all three Gospel accounts referring to Jesus' action over the bread as blessing.

(R.S.V.) In the Feeding of the Four Thousand, however,

εὐλογεῖν is used only by Mark and that in reference to the blessing of the fish (Mk 8:7) which is not paralleled in Matthew. It should be noted that Mark's comment about the distribution of the fish in the Feeding of the 5,000 (Mk. 6:41) is not paralleled in Matthew or Luke either. From this evidence we may infer that

$\epsilon\upsilon\lambda\omicron\gamma\pi\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\nu$ is Mark's characteristic expression in 6:41. It is strange, however, that it should appear in reference to the second element, the fish, in Mk. 8:7 and only in reference to the first element, the bread in Mk. 14:22. The verb $\epsilon\upsilon\chi\alpha\rho\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega$ is used in reference to the wine v. 23, but in reference to the bread in 8:6 (Mt. 15:36). In fact, $\epsilon\upsilon\chi\alpha\rho\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega$ occurs uniformly in the Feeding of the 4,000 except in Mk. 8:7 which is peculiar to Mark. And $\epsilon\upsilon\lambda\omicron\gamma\epsilon\omega$ occurs uniformly in the Feeding of the 5,000 where there is no reference to Jesus' blessing the fish but only to his distribution of them, (Mk. 6:41). We may conclude, then, that $\epsilon\upsilon\lambda\omicron\gamma\epsilon\omega$ and $\epsilon\upsilon\chi\alpha\rho\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega$ cannot be attached to the action over any particular element or sacrificial food: bread, wine, or fish, but it may be that $\epsilon\upsilon\lambda\omicron\gamma\epsilon\omega$ is a word more characteristic of the Markan eucharistic tradition since it is used only by Mark in the Feeding of the 4,000, (6:41). Another possibility is that if the Feeding of the 4,000 and the Feeding of the 5,000 are simply different versions of the same story; $\epsilon\upsilon\lambda\omicron\gamma\epsilon\omega$ and $\epsilon\upsilon\chi\alpha\rho\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega$ may be key words in each of these versions. In other words, one of the words may be peculiar to each

version.¹

There is, however, a difficulty in trying to make a hard and fast rule as to the use of the two words in the two versions. The difficulty is that we find an example of the use of *εὐχάριστεω* in John's version of the Feeding of the 5,000 (Jn. 6:1-15), which according to our hypothesis should have used *εὐλογεω* exclusively. In Jn. 6:11 we read that Jesus gave thanks (*εὐχάριστεω*) over the bread. Where did John get this word? Perhaps it is his stylistic preference, or he may have known the story of the Feeding of the 4,000. It is striking that John's narrative follows Mark's in the following significant details not found in Matthew and Luke: 1) mention is made by the disciples

¹ According to R. Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition 1953, p. 217, what we have here is an original story, (Mk. 6:34-44 par.) and a variant form (Mk. 8:1-9 par.). It is striking, however, that one of the reasons Bultmann deduces for the originality of the first part of Mk. 8:1-9 par, is that *εὐχάριστεω* has not been added except in 8:6 sic. (8:7?). According to Bultmann this addition was supplied from 6:34-44. May we not add with greater accuracy that it was supplied from 6:43 which represents Mark's unique contribution in each pericope? Mark wants to emphasize that the fish was distributed as well as the bread, Perhaps this emphasis points to an early tradition of fish as a Eucharistic symbol.

COPYRIGHT WARNING

Notice: warning concerning copyright restrictions

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specific conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be "used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research." If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of "fair use," that user may be liable for copyright infringement. This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

The Origin and Meaning
of the
Eucharistic Words in the New Testament
And Parallels in
Some Modern Liturgies

Senior Thesis
April 13, 1966
John Starr Greenman

Contents

Chapter I	The Origin and Meaning of the Eucharistic Words in the New Testament
Chapter II	The Earliest Setting of the Eucharist
Chapter III	The Meaning of the Eucharistic Words in some Modern Liturgies
Appendix I	Some Modern Orders of Worship

In recent decades, liturgical studies has joined hands with New Testament studies in a search to discover the origin and earliest meaning of the Eucharist. New Testament findings have been applied to modern liturgies in the hope of attaining some measure of the closeness to Our Lord and vitality of life and expression which characterized the Early Church.

Some problems have marred this research and caused pessimism as to the usefulness of the results. Very little is known about the earliest liturgical practices of the Pre-Pauline church. Furthermore the Gospels themselves are open to the charge of perpetrating liturgical formulae rather than the primitive tradition close to the original words of Jesus. Once this charge has been met, there is the problem of the influence of contemporaneous Jewish religious practices and groups and the influence of Hellenistic Christianity and the problem of the primitive liturgies themselves. Do they represent tendencies already present in the Gospels and Epistles or does the researcher fall into the trap of reading into the New Testament what he finds in the writings of the Early Fathers? Finally, there is a tangle of theological issues when liturgical renewal is discussed: what is the role of tradition and innovation, of Word and Sacrament, aesthetical appreciation and pragmatic consideration,

balance and imbalance, serenity and turbulence.

In spite of these difficulties, I am optimistic about the possibilities of liturgical renewal through New Testament studies. The New Testament is the treasury of Our Lord's life. Its treasure is never spent. And through its study, we learn the inner relationships between seemingly unrelated events. So it is with the liturgy which is the well-spring of the Church's devotion. Through the study of the liturgy we will find what is already there, but our New Testament studies will help us. One of the things we will, I think, discover through this joint study is the way in which to respond to the account of the Last Supper when it is rehearsed in the Words of Institution. Let us join our brethren of the Church of South India in their solemn gladness when they reply:

Amen. Thy death, O Lord, we commemorate,
thy resurrection we confess, and thy
second coming we wait. Glory be to
thee, O Christ.

Chapter One

The Origin and Meaning of the Eucharistic Words in the New Testament

We will take Mk. 14:22-24 as the pericope for exegesis because it is the simplest in form and vocabulary and because the other synoptic and Pauline variants seem either to be influenced by Mark directly or to know the same or similar tradition.

In examining the parallel Greek versions of the institution of the Lord's Supper, (Mt. 26:26-28, Mk. 14:22-24, Lk. 22:17-20 and I Cor. 11:23-25), it appears that the similarities among these texts are greater than the differences although each text has features characteristic of its author. In comparing Mark with Matthew, we find as would be expected a well established, common form and vocabulary which may be reconstructed as follows:

...As they were eating (he) took bread, and blessed, and broke it, and (gave) it to (them) and said, "take... this is my body."

And he took a cup (and) when he had given thanks he gave it to them, (and they) all (drank) of it. (And he said to them), "This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out (for) many... ."¹

ἐσθίωντων αὐτῶν λαβὼν ἄρτον
εὐλογησας ἔκλασεν καὶ εἶπεν
λαβετε τοῦτο ἐστί τὸ σῶμα μου
καὶ λαβὼν πετηρίων καὶ
εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ
εἶπεν ἕξ αὐτοῦ πάντες. καὶ
εἶπεν αὐτοῖς τοῦτο ἐστί τὸ
αἷμα μου τῆς διαθήκης τοῦ
ἐκχυννόμενου ὡς πολλῶν.

Mk 14:22-24

Mt. 26:26

-28

¹ Adapted from Huck-Lietzmann, Synopsis, 1936, p. 186.

This is the core of the tradition as it is preserved in both Mark and Matthew. The form and wording in this core are the same in both Mark and Matthew with a few exceptions. The form of the tradition is that of two narrative sentences which follow each other directly consisting of three parts: 1) a brief narrative setting (v. 22a) and further narrative details (vv. 23c, 24a) - "as they were eating," "and they drank," "and he said to them" - 2) Jesus' actions, and 3) Jesus' words accompanying the actions.

The initial setting serves to connect the Matthean and Markan pericopes with the Passion Narrative, (Mt. 26:21, 26; Mk. 14:18, 22). The opening clause is anticipated by the setting in Mk. 14:17-18 and parallels which is described in v. 12 as "the first day of Unleavened Bread, When they sacrificed the passover lamb." Discussion of the chronological problem of actual dating of the Last Supper will be reserved for Chapter two. But for our present purposes, it is sufficient to say that the Markan pericope under discussion is presented as an integral part of the Passion Narrative and linked to it by bits of narrative detail.

The description of Mt. 26:26a *ἐσθίουτων δε αὐτῶν* and Mk. 14:22a *καὶ ἐσθίουτων αὐτῶν* as "bits of narrative detail" implies that they are incidental to the text which follows. Perhaps they are in fact only

the cement which binds together diverse elements of tradition. One gains this impression from comparing Mk. 14:22a with its apparant duplicate, 14:18, *ἡ ἀνάκλησις τοῦ κυρίου* *καὶ τῆς εὐχαριστίας*. For Mk. 14:22-24 and par. shows no reflection of the preparations recounted in vv. 12-16 or the announcement of the traitor vv. 17-21. Vv. 22-25 as well as the preceding sections seems to be a self contained unit. What of the narrative setting, then? It is either a bit of narrative mortar added by Mark as its duplication in Mk. 14:18 indicates. Or it is a special part of the words of institution. The latter is Jeremias' view. He points to Paul's similar setting in ICor 11:23a *ἐν τῇ κυρίῳ τῇ ἑσπερῇ* and compares the Markan pericope with the Pauline account of the Last Supper. Mark uses the same three verbs as Paul, *ἁγάπησεν* and *ἐκάλει* (although Mark uses *εὐλογοῦντας* instead of the Pauline *εὐχαριστοῦντας*). This fact argues for a common tradition underlying both accounts. But Mark adds the fourth verb *ἐδοκεν αὐτοῖς* which, Jeremias thinks, implies the liturgical character of the Markan account, (possibly because it refers to an action of the leader toward the participants).¹ This liturgical tendency is even more pronounced in Matthew, says Jeremias. Matthew adds

¹ J. Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, 1955, p. 108.

ἀγιος and τοῖς ~~μαρτυροῦσι~~ in
26:26 making the introduction (setting) read "like a
new beginning, and the liturgical tone becomes even more
emphatic."¹ Furthermore, Matthew connects ἀβω
and εὐδοκίας by καὶ and
substitutes σοὺς for ἐγὼ κεν .
These changes subordinate the thanksgiving and the
distribution to the breaking of the bread, καὶ ἁρξας τοῦ
ἄρτου , "which has become the essential
feature of the first act."²

This analysis makes comparisons which are undoubtedly
important for our understanding of the Markan, Matthean, and
Pauline viewpoints. But it is one thing to point out the
comparisons and another thing to explain their meaning.
Jeremias explains their meaning by recourse to a form
critical device, the Pre-Markan liturgical (cultic)
formula. This may be a useful device. How else, for
instance are we to explain the fact that all four Gospels
contain substantially the same order of events in the
Passion Narrative from the Entry into Jerusalem to the
Empty Tomb? If all the Gospel writers knew substantially
the same Passion tradition, perhaps Jeremias is justified
in saying that they all knew the same tradition of the
Last Supper, (although this is questionable). Even if this

¹ Ibid.
² Ibid.

were so, we could not automatically assume that this Last Supper tradition was a liturgical formula conditioned by the worship of the early church. For Acts does not tell of any recollection of the Last Supper in "the breaking of the bread."

If the comparisons here noted are a matter of style, they may reveal more about their authors than they do about the primitive Eucharist. This possibility must be kept in mind. It is tempting to make the individual words bear the weight of a whole Eucharistic theology. And yet the New Testament accounts and their texts are all we have to go on; so that it is necessary to try to understand the shades of meaning which individual words imply. And finally, it is necessary to remember that classification of the words, (in this case a liturgical formula), does not exhaust their meaning or remove them from scrutiny.

The further narrative details, (Mk. 14:23c, 24a), are significant not only as narrative connectors but because the mood has changed in the Matthean version from the indicative to the imperative, (Mk 14:23c; Mt. 26:27c; Mk. 14:24a; Mt. 26:28); and from direct discourse "and they all drank of it," and phrase "and he said to them," to a direct command, "Drink of it..." which continues uninterrupted by further narrative detail. From these observations it appears that the

Matthean version makes the Markan syntax more complex. Matthew is generally apt to change Markan narrative into direct quotation; this is characteristic of the first Gospel.

Let us now consider Jesus' actions. These actions are expressed succinctly by the words: "took ... and having blessed ... broke and gave", (of the bread and similarly of the cup), "took ... and having given thanks, gave."

The Greek word *λάνθάνω*, "to take" is a common expression sometimes used redundantly to create a more lively narrative.¹ It is not difficult to find examples of the latter usage in the New Testament. Such usage frequently occurs in the passion narrative and in parables. Three parables, those of the mustard seed (Mt. 13:31 // Lk. 13:19); the leaven (Mt. 13:33 // Lk. 13:21), and the wise and foolish virgins, (Mt. 25:1-4) make use of *λάνθάνω*; Mt. 25:1-4 reiterates the word four times. But more significant for our purposes is the frequent use of this redundant word in the Passion Narrative. Here are some examples some of which show redundancy.

"... and (they) took the reed and struck him in the head"

Mt. 27:30

"When he had washed their feet and taken his garments..."
Jn. 13:12

¹

Bauer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, p. 465.

"Then Pilate took Jesus and scourged him."
Jn. 19:1

"... they took his garments and made four parts." ¹
Jn. 19:23

It is more than sufficient to say that they took a reed or took his garments before they did something else. Naturally one takes a reed before one strikes another and one takes another's garments before they are divided in four parts. The taking itself is superfluous, the action which follows is what is significant.

In certain New England regions one hears colloquial phrases such as, "I up and went" or "I took and baked a cake." In these cases it is the going and the baking which are the important actions, i.e. necessary to the plain sense of the sentence, but the colloquial additions enliven the narrative. It is more ~~colloquial~~ to say, "I took and baked a cake." than simply "I baked a cake," although the plain sense is preserved even when the verb "to take" is removed.

This colloquial coloration is perhaps part of the reason for Mark's use of *ἔλαβεν* in his account of the Last Supper. It is obvious that Jesus would have to have taken the bread before he could have

¹ Ibid., see also Mk. 15:23; Jn. 19:30. Other usages include general references, (Mk. 9:36, Mk. 7:27 // Mt. 15:26; Mt. 10:38) and specific references to the taking and breaking of bread, (Lk. 24:30; Ac. 9:19; 27:35) and even the taking of sacrificial animals, (Hb. 9:19-22).

broken it and taken the cup before he could have given it to them. Thus linguistically speaking, one might say he blessed and broke the bread and gave thanks and gave them the cup without destroying the meaning of the important actions. On the other hand, liturgically speaking, the taking has meaning in the rite of the P.E.C.U.S.A., and we cannot rule out the possibility that it also had meaning for the synoptic writers. In the American Prayer Book during the consecration prayer just before the words, "he took bread," the following rubric is inserted.

(a) here the Priest is to take the Paten into his hands. Similarly, the following rubric appears before the words, "he took the cup":

(d) here he is to take the Cup into his hands. It seems that this taking into the hands has a meaning of its own; a significant action is taking place by which the food is set aside, dedicated or blessed through the hands of the priest.¹ Let us note the preparatory function of taking. By it the food is prepared and by it the reader of Mark is prepared for what is to come.

¹ The sooner we get rid of the idea that the so-called "elements" are what is blessed the better. What we need is a recovery of the Hebrew meaning of blessing by which God is blessed and therefore the food is sanctified. According to Walter Lowrie, The Lord's Supper and the Liturgy, 1943, p. 7, the prayer of thanksgiving at the Last Supper was the same one used by Jesus at the feedings of the multitudes. Its purpose, then, was not to change the food but to make it holy as an efficacious sacrament.

See also Lowrie's suggestive remarks on the "priesthood of all believers" in the Eucharist, (p. 14).

Not so in the Words of Institution, Mk. 14:22-25 and par.: "Take, this is my body." For here the whole sense of the command is understood by the word "take". It is not merely a linguistic redundancy or a liturgical preparation but the whole action of receiving and eating. This may be why Matthew (26:26) adds the $\phi\alpha\gamma\epsilon\tau\epsilon$, "eat." What is understood in Mark becomes explicit liturgically in Matthew.¹ It may be right to follow Jeremias' reasoning here that $\lambda\alpha\beta\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ "take," is original since it also appears in Luke. Perhaps as Jeremias says represents a real "formula of invitation ... used when the bread and the cup of blessing (at the Passover) were handed round."² But in any case it is doubtful that Matthew thought he was making a radical change in Mark by adding $\phi\alpha\gamma\epsilon\tau\epsilon, \lambda\alpha\beta\epsilon\tau\epsilon$. Matthew was probably only spelling out what Mark had understood implicitly: that $\lambda\alpha\beta\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ expressed the whole command of what the disciples were to do with their Master's offering, receiving it and consuming it.

Having raised the question of the relation of the words "take" and "eat" in the Matthean text, let us take a closer look at the word $\epsilon\tau\eta\gamma\alpha\gamma\epsilon\tau\epsilon$. In general its meanings fall into three categories: of ordinary activities, with reference to the Passover, and of Jesus' meals with his

¹ Jeremias, op. cit., p. 109.
² Ibid.

disciples. In the Old Testament *אכל* is used in Joseph's dire prediction of the chief baker's fate in Gen. 40:19, "... the birds will eat the flesh from you."¹ A more common usage is found in Ex. 2:20 and in Ruth 2:14 in reference to ordinary meals. In the Gospels one finds Jesus quoting an Old Testament situation to justify plucking and eating grain on the sabbath. Jesus refers to David's eating of the bread of the presence (I Sam. 21:1-6; Lev. 24:9) an incident recorded in all three Gospels, (Mt. 12:4; Mk. 2:26; Lk. 6:4). This incident is part of Jesus' polemic against the ritual rigorism of the pharisees, (Mt. 15:2; Mk. 7:5f; Mk. 2:16 and parallels Lk. 14:1-6). Other references to Old Testament uses of *אכל* are found in Lk. 17:27; I Cor 10:7; 15:32. These passages refer to the carefree days of eating and drinking before the final judgment.² The mood of luxurious or even dissipated living before judgment is reflected in Jesus' parable of the Faithful and Wise servant, (Mt. 25:45-51), and The Parable of the Rich Fool, (Lk. 12:13-21). In the Parable of The Servant's Wages (Lk. 17:17-10), and the logion from Lk. 12:22 *אכל* also stands for ordinary eating.

The use of this word in reference to the Passover is naturally more restricted. It may be found in Old Testament accounts of the Passover (Ezra 6:21f; II Ch. 30:18f). We

¹ In the New Testament, Rev. 17:16; 19:18 refer to eating someone's flesh.

² See R. S. V. for original Old Testament passages.

have also mentioned the setting of the Passion Narrativeⁱ in Mk. 14 and par. especially vv. 12 and 14 in Mk. 12 which speak of "eating the Passover", (Jn. 18:28). The cry of one who sat at table with Jesus in Lk. 14:15 "Blessed is he who shall eat bread in the Kingdom of God!" certainly voices an eschatological expectation which is also a central theme at Passover. The word *εσθίω* as well as the act of eating itself has close associations with the Passover as with the Lord's Supper.

Outside the narratives of the Last Supper themselves there exist a number of passages which appear to have a close connection with the Supper. Mark's account of the Feeding of the 4,000 (8:1 // Mt. 15:36x) and the Feeding of the 5,000 (Mk. 6:41 and parallels) must have a close connection with the Last Supper accounts (also Lk. 24:30). The significant terminology is very close and will be examined in greater detail later on. Jn. 6:48-59 is a commentary on the supper and will also receive fuller treatment.¹ In Acts while there are frequent references to the breaking of bread, (2:42; 20:7, 11) Paul's meal on shipboard during the voyage to Rome, (Acts 27:35),

¹

Let it be said here that there can be no doubt that the Feeding of the Multitudes is a Eucharistic setting. John appreciates this fact when he precedes his Eucharistic commentary by his own account of the Feeding of the Multitude (Jn. 6:1-15). Lowrie, *op. cit.*, p. 4, affirms the close connection between the Eucharist and the Feedings by citing examples of primitive Christian art in which "the Eucharist is represented, not by a picture of Christ and his disciples seated at a table in the upper room, but by groups of Christians which by the presence of baskets of bread and the two fish are clearly associated with the multitude in the wilderness.

commands central interest.¹ I Cor. 10:16 should also be mentioned as a possible later development of the Words of Institution.

Two words describing the actions of Jesus at the Last Supper are close in meaning: *εὐλογεῖν* and *εὐχαριστεῖν* which follows *εὐχαριστησας* (Mk. 14:22 par.), is translated he "blessed" in the R.S.V.; whereas *εὐχαριστησας* is rendered "when he had given thanks" when it appears in the next verse after the taking of the cup. The question is how close are these words in meaning? Are they interchangeable or does one represent a more technical meaning than the other?²

¹ C. D. F. Moule, Worship in the New Testament, 1961, p. 27, declares that "it would be almost ludicrous" to suppose that Paul did something "sacramental." It is too bad that Professor Moule's concept of what is "sacramental" blinds him to the possibility that Paul's meal really was an early bread Eucharist, (such as, we shall see is examined by Cullmann). Lowrie, op. cit., p. 13 rightly comments; "This example of the Apostle must restrain us from denouncing absolutely any exception to common custom which is prompted and justified by circumstances."

² Lowrie, op. cit., p. 7 claims the two words are equivalent. The form of consecration which they imply is the same as that used by Jesus at the Feeding of the Multitudes and the Last Supper. It was and is consequently the whole prayer of thanksgiving which consecrated the food, (not any particular part of it, e.g. the memorial of the Passion, etc.). See C.W.F. Smith, "Action in the Liturgy," Dr. Lowrie of Princeton and Rome, ed. A. C. Zabriskie, 1957, p. 87.

But Jeremias, op. cit., p. 108 regards *εὐλογεῖν* as "normal for grace before meat" and *εὐχαριστεῖν* as a "gracifying" tendency. Actually Mark uses both words (Mk. 14:22, 23; 6:41; 8:6,7). And apparently he uses them interchangeably. It would be disastrous to make these words distinctive tags of different conceptions of the Eucharist.

In its primary meaning *εὐλογέω* means to "speak well, praise, extol" but also to "give thanks" or "to bless." The latter is perhaps the most significant for our purposes since it appears in the stories of the Feeding of the Five Thousand (Mk. 6:41; Mt. 14:19; Lk. 9:16) and the Feeding of the Four Thousand, (Mk. 8:1-10 but not Mt. 15:32-39).

καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς πεντε ἄρτους Mt. 14:19
καὶ σου ἰχθύας ἀναβλέψας εἰς Mk. 6:41
τοὺς ὄψαντες εὐλογησέν... Lk. 9:16

ἐλάβεν τοὺς ἑπτὰ	... καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς
ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς	ἑπτὰ ἄρτους
ἰχθύας καὶ	εὐχαρίστησας...
εὐχαρίστησας.	καὶ εὐλογησας
Mt. 15:36	αὐτὰ ἐπέεν καὶ
	ταῦτα πάλιν ἐβέναι.
	Mk. 8:6, 7.

The story of the Feeding of the Five Thousand contains

εὐλογέω once in all three Gospel accounts referring to Jesus' action over the bread as blessing.

(R.S.V.) In the Feeding of the Four Thousand, however,

εὐλογέω is used only by Mark and that in reference to the blessing of the fish (Mk 8:7) which is not paralleled in Matthew. It should be noted that Mark's comment about the distribution of the fish in the Feeding of the 5,000 (Mk. 6:41) is not paralleled in Matthew or Luke either. From this evidence we may infer that

$\epsilon\upsilon\lambda\omicron\gamma\pi\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\nu$ is Mark's characteristic expression in 6:41. It is strange, however, that it should appear in reference to the second element, the fish, in Mk. 8:7 and only in reference to the first element, the bread in Mk. 14:22. The verb $\epsilon\upsilon\chi\alpha\rho\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega$ is used in reference to the wine v. 23, but in reference to the bread in 8:6 (Mt. 15:36). In fact, $\epsilon\upsilon\chi\alpha\rho\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega$ occurs uniformly in the Feeding of the 4,000 except in Mk. 8:7 which is peculiar to Mark. And $\epsilon\upsilon\lambda\omicron\gamma\epsilon\omega$ occurs uniformly in the Feeding of the 5,000 where there is no reference to Jesus' blessing the fish but only to his distribution of them, (Mk. 6:41). We may conclude, then, that $\epsilon\upsilon\lambda\omicron\gamma\epsilon\omega$ and $\epsilon\upsilon\chi\alpha\rho\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega$ cannot be attached to the action over any particular element or sacrificial food: bread, wine, or fish, but it may be that $\epsilon\upsilon\lambda\omicron\gamma\epsilon\omega$ is a word more characteristic of the Markan eucharistic tradition since it is used only by Mark in the Feeding of the 4,000, (6:41). Another possibility is that if the Feeding of the 4,000 and the Feeding of the 5,000 are simply different versions of the same story; $\epsilon\upsilon\lambda\omicron\gamma\epsilon\omega$ and $\epsilon\upsilon\chi\alpha\rho\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega$ may be key words in each of these versions. In other words, one of the words may be peculiar to each

version.¹

There is, however, a difficulty in trying to make a hard and fast rule as to the use of the two words in the two versions. The difficulty is that we find an example of the use of *ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΕΩ* in John's version of the Feeding of the 5,000 (Jn. 6:1-15), which according to our hypothesis should have used *ΕΥΧΑΙΩ* exclusively. In Jn. 6:11 we read that Jesus gave thanks (*ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΕΩ*) over the bread. Where did John get this word? Perhaps it is his stylistic preference, or he may have known the story of the Feeding of the 4,000. It is striking that John's narrative follows Mark's in the following significant details not found in Matthew and Luke: 1) mention is made by the disciples

¹ According to R. Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition 1953, p. 217, what we have here is an original story, (Mk. 6:34-44 par.) and a variant form (Mk. 8:1-9 par.). It is striking, however, that one of the reasons Bultmann deduces for the originality of the first part of Mk. 8:1-9 par, is that *ΕΥΧΑΙΩ* has not been added except in 8:6 sic. (8:7?). According to Bultmann this addition was supplied from 6:34-44. May we not add with greater accuracy that it was supplied from 6:43 which represents Mark's unique contribution in each pericope? Mark wants to emphasize that the fish was distributed as well as the bread, Perhaps this emphasis points to an early tradition of fish as a Eucharistic symbol.

of "two hundred denarii worth of bread"; 2) the number of men who sat down on the grass is alluded to, (Mk. 6:40, Jn. 6:10); 3) special emphasis is laid on the distribution of the fish, (Mk. 6:41 and Jn. 6:11)¹. Thus Mark declares "... he divided the two fish among them all"; whereas John asserts that, "Jesus took the loaves, and when he had given thanks *Εὐχαρίστησεν*, he distributed them to those who were seated; so also the fish ... ,²" (my italics). It is not possible to tell whether John means that Jesus merely distributed the fish or that he gave thanks over the fish at the same time as the bread or that he did so separately. But we can say that the Johannine version of the Feeding of the 5,000 follows the Markan version except in the use of *Εὐχαρίστησεν* in John. In this usage John follows the accounts of the Feeding of the 4,000 or the Last Supper or perhaps the term was simply more popular among Greek-speaking Christians.

The word *Εὐχαρίστησεν*, as we have said has a meaning close if not equivalent to that of *Εὐχαρίστω* (see above). *Εὐχαρίστησεν* means to "be thankful, feel obligated to thank" primarily. In ordinary usage the Pharisee thanks God that he is not like other men, (Lk. 18:11), and Paul thanks Prisca and Aquila who risked

¹ Mark also refers to the gathering up of the fish as well as the broken pieces of bread in v. 42.

² The Greek word in John is not "fish" *ἰχθύς* but *ὀψον* i.e., anything eaten with bread.

their lives for him, (Ro. 16:4). Secondly means to give thanks especially to God, (Lk. 17:16, Ac. 28:15; Ro. 1:21; I cor. 14:18; Eph. 5:4; Phil. 1:3; Col. 1:3, 12; 3:17; Phlm 4). In this meaning, it can apply especially to grace before meals, (Ac. 27:35-36; Ro. 14:6). We have already discussed the question as to whether Paul celebrated the eucharist with his companions on board ship, (above).

The word *ἐκλάσεν* gives a clue to the sort of meal referred to in these passages. *κλάω*, "I break", occurs frequently in the Bible but only in reference to bread.

No one shall break bread for the mourner,
to comfort him for the dead; nor shall any
one give him the cup of consolation to
drink for his father or his mother.
(Jer. 16:7)¹

In Isa. 58:7 the breaking of the bread (here, *ἵνα ἁποστρέψῃ τὸ ὄψος*) is the means "by which the father of the household gave the signal to begin the meal."²

Jesus also followed this practice as we have seen from the passages already cited and in the story of the meeting on the road to Emmaus (Lk. 24:30). In v. 35 the noun form *κλάσις* also occurs (Ac. 2:42). The meals of the early Christians were occasions for the breaking of bread, (Ac. 2:46; 20:7, 11; 27:35; I Cor 10:16). But from the

¹

Moule, op. cit., p. 20, makes a mistake, I think, in concluding from this passage that these words are "outside a strictly sacramental context," and, therefore, that the word *κλάω* has no significance for the study of the origin of the Eucharist.

² Bauer, op. cit., p. 434

usage of the word *ἐκδοκεν* itself there is no evidence that these Christian meals had any more or any less religious significance than did an ordinary Jewish meal. The verb to give *ἐδοκεν* also seems to lack any technical connotation although it is interesting that its only reference to bread outside the passages already cited occurs in connection with "the bread of the presence," (Mk. 2:26 // Lk. 6:4).

The four versions of the Words of Institution (Mt. 26:26-29; Mk. 14:22-25; Lk. 22:17-23; I. Cor. 11:23-25), maybe broken down into four parts: the introduction, the words over the bread and wine, the words commanding a repetition of the action, and the eschatological words. There is great variation among these versions, however, as to the actual occurrence, position, and wording of these parts. In fact one part, the words commanding a repetition of the action is found only in Lk. 22:19b and I Cor. 11:24b, 25b, that is, "Do this... in remembrance of me," (the Lucan version lacks these words after the wine words). As for position, the eschatological words are found near the beginning of the Lucan text (22:16) although verse 15 appears to be a unique declaration of Jesus' intention and prediction of suffering of a different origin from the eschatological words common to 22:16; Mt. 26:29; Mk. 14:25. Perhaps Lk. 22:15 is from Luke's special source. The Pauline version contains a different form of the

eschatological theme (I Cor. 11:26): "For as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes."

It is also important to note that - depending on whether one accepts the longer text (Lk. 22:15-20) or the shorter text (vv. 15-19a) of Luke - part of the words over the bread and wine may be missing from Luke. If the shorter text is original, then the cup, (v. 17), precedes the bread, (v. 19). But if the originality of the longer text is accepted, there are two cups (vv. 17-20). One cup is at the beginning of the meal and one at the end, (v. 25). This gives the impression of a more elaborate meal, perhaps a Passover, (v. 15). The increase in the number of cups in the longer text is thus a clue to the possible paschal character of the meal since at the Passover there were four cups, (five counting the cup of Elijah). The latter would agree with Jeremias' argument that the Last Supper was a Passover but others would point to the similarity of Lk. 22:20 with Mk. 14:24 and especially I Cor. 11:25. It would seem therefore that we have in Luke two separate Eucharistic traditions one peculiar to Luke and one which he shares with Paul and the Synoptists. Their present arrangement in Luke's Gospel may mean that Luke thought of the Last Supper as a Passover, but it does not prove that this was the case historically. We shall take up this problem of the Lucan text in the course of dealing with the variations in

wording among the four accounts.

Returning to our discussion of the introduction to the Words of Institution, Vincent Taylor points out that the words, "and as they were eating," *καὶ ἐσθίουσιν αὐτῶν*, (Mk. 14:22) are so similar to the structure of the opening words of Mk. 14:17 as to point to the assimilation of the phrasing from one text to the other.¹ This probable assimilation indicates that we are dealing with two "separate items of tradition" which once stood by themselves. Taylor cites the Pauline setting (I Cor. 11:23), "on the night when he was betrayed", *ἐν τῇ νύκτι ἣν παραδόσθαι* to show that Last Supper accounts like Mark's and Paul's could stand alone. Paul's account may have been written in or near Antioch while the many Markan Semitisms point to Mark's Palestinian origin.² This line of argument points to Taylor's conclusion that "the Markan narrative commends itself as one of the oldest, if not the most ancient of the accounts." To clarify the matter we can say that the Pauline account is chronologically before Mark but that the Markan tradition is older. Taylor says that Mark reveals "the singularly original manner in which Jesus conceived the nature of his redemptive death and related the Eucharist thereto," (my italics).³ This statement contrasts

¹ Vincent Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark, p. 543f. Hans Lietzmann, Mass and Lord's Supper, p. 179, infers that in the Markan church, "the rite of the Lord's Supper formed the conclusion of a common meal."

² For an exhaustive list of Markan Semitisms see Jeremias, op. cit., pp. 118-127.

³ Taylor, op. cit., p. 543.

with most scholarly views which make much of the fact that the earliest accounts of Christian Eucharists in the New Testament contain no reference to the Last Supper. The Markan account may, therefore, be seen as growing out of the general context of Jesus' sayings in the Passion Narrative rather than a liturgical context as seems to be implied in I Cor. 11:26.¹ Taylor's comment also contrasts with the position of Lietzmann and Gullman, (to be discussed later), that Paul made the original connection between the death of Jesus and the early Eucharist.

Returning to the introduction of the versions of the Last Supper, we note that Jeremias adds to Taylor on the significance of Paul's words (I Cor. 11:23,24). For whereas Taylor is only concerned with the originality of Mark as compared with Paul, Jeremias in addition wants to prove that both Paul and Mark depend upon a common Eucharistic tradition preserved as a liturgical formula.² Jeremias, therefore, points to the "ceremonial sound" of Paul's formal "proclamation"; "the Lord Jesus on the night when he was betrayed..."³. The reference to "the night when he was betrayed" is not merely chronological but used absolutely to refer to an action of God.⁴ Jeremias bases the latter point on a reference to Rom. 4:25 which

¹ Moule, op. cit., pp. 21-22, on the other hand, thinks the Pauline tradition represents what was current in the church from the very first.

² Jeremias, op. cit., pp. 108-127.

³ Ibid., p. 107.

contains "a periphrasis for the Divine name." God becomes the agent of the betrayal, i.e. "God delivered Him up,"

παράδωκετο, in the manner of Isa. 53:4; Ac. 2:23.

Jeremias further shows the liturgical nature of the texts by the three verbs Paul uses in describing the prayer at table, "took bread and when he had given thanks, he

broke it, ..." ελάβεν ἄρτον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας

The latter verb, εὐχαρίστησας is an example of

Paul's tendency to "Graecise". The same verb is found in

Luke although Mark uses εὐλογήσας and adds yet

another verb, "he gave" ἔδωκεν which may denote

liturgical action. Similarly Matthew may be seen to

emphasise the liturgical form of the text in his addition

of the emphatic "Jesus" and "the disciples", (26:26). A

similar construction is available in Mt. 16:20 and par.

Mt. 16:20

τότε φηστέλατο
τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἵνα
μῆθεν ἐπωποιοῦτε
αὐτοῖς ὅτις ὁ Χριστός.

Mk. 8:30

καὶ ἐπέμνησεν
αὐτοῖς ἵνα μὴθεν
ῥεωποιοῦ περὶ
αὐτοῦ.

We have already discussed Jeremias' view that the liturgical

organization is tightened by Matthew's addition of καὶ

between λαβὼν and εὐλογήσας. And we have

seen that Matthew's substitution of φουσ, (the

present participle), for ἔδωκεν, (the imperfect

indicative) deemphasizes the "giving" in favor of the

breaking of the bread.¹ We are now in a position to say

¹
Ibid., p. 108.

that Matthew's emphasis is on the sayings of Jesus, λαβετε , φαγετε . He also wants to draw attention to the disciples' participation. Mark, by contrast, makes more of the act of giving, εδωκεν . It is the offering and distribution which matter. Mark is the basis of both Matthew and Luke, (which was also influenced by Pauline Graecising), but according to Jeremias "the variations in the four introductions ... are not literary corrections, but the reflection of liturgical development."¹ I think it would be more helpful here to refer to stylistic corrections since what we are dealing with is the individual style of the writer which seemed appropriate to him because of his particular Sitzim Leben. As I have said above, there is really no reason to go down the line with Jeremias who insists on a Pre Markan liturgical formula even though there is a reasonable probability that all four Gospels knew the same or similar Passion Tradition.

According to Jeremias' literary criticism of the words over the bread and wine, the original words seem to be: λαβετε τουτο εστιν το σωμα μου ("take, this is my body") and τουτο εστιν το αιμα μου της διαθηκης το εκχυνμενον υπερ πολλων ("This is my blood of the covenant which is poured out for many,") or the Markan words.²

¹ Ibid., pp. 108-109; Lietzmann, op. cit., p. 175, emphasises that Matthew's "literary dependence" makes further consideration of this Gospel unprofitable. But to dismiss Matthew so easily robs us of his unique insight as to the nature of the Eucharist.

² Jeremias, op. cit., p. 115.

Jeremias' inclusion of the word *λάβετε* ("take") is disputed by Lietzmann since he feels it to be an insignificant liturgical addition.¹ Jeremias bases his argument on Luke's inclusion of *λάβετε* in 22:17.² This argument implies that Luke in 22:15-19a, (the shorter text), had independent access to a pre-Markan tradition and was not copying from Mark. *λάβετε* would thus be part of the pre-Markan tradition. As for Matthew's inclusion of the command, *φαγετε* ("eat"), Jeremias includes it in a parallelism with the Matthean wine words, *πιετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες*, ("Drink of it all of you," 26:27); both may be examples of secondary liturgical formula or of Matthew's special emphasis. The command to drink is based on Mark's statement (14:23) which Matthew characteristically³ changes to direct quotation.⁴

If Jeremias is right, we may infer that *φαγετε* was added by Matthew to balance *πιετε* liturgically. Another case of liturgical parallelism may be the words *εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς* which were added, according to Lietzmann, to the words describing the taking of the cup; so that the cup words would be parallel to the bread words *εὐλογῆσας ἐκλάσεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς*. It is important for Lietzmann to establish this parallelism; so that he can dismiss the cup words as

¹ Lietzmann, *op. cit.*, p. 178.

² Jeremias, *op. cit.*, p. 109.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 113, n. 1.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 113.

secondary and therefore not needing further consideration. He wants to prove that Mark reflects a certain rite in which "the Lord's Supper formed the conclusion of a common meal."¹ But this radical dissection of the Markan account is too high a price to pay for Lietzmann's conclusion, which, however, I think is a desirable one. Again, the assumption of a Eucharistic rite behind Mark is nothing but a conjecture in my opinion.

Still another example of so-called liturgical parallelism is said to be found in I Cor. 11:24 in the words *το ὅπερ ἑνών*, "which (is broken) for you." Only this time, the parallelism is not within one Gospel as in the cases above but between I Cor. 11:24 and Lk. 22:19b (based on Mk. 14:24 par.).

Mk. 14:24	Lk. 22:19b	I Cor. 11:24
καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς		τοῦτο μου ἐστίν
τοῦτο ἐστὶν ἄρτος	το ὅπερ ἑμῶν	το σῶμα το
μου τῆς διαθήκης	σῶσθαι	ὅπερ ἑμῶν.
το ἐκχυννόμενον	τοῦτο ποιεῖτε	τοῦτο παῖτε
ὅπερ πολλῶν	εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν	εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν.
	ἀναμνηστὲς.	ἀναμνηστὲς.

Jeremias maintains that the Pauline phrase *το ὅπερ ἑμῶν*

is an assimilation to the bread of the Markan wine words, *το ἐκχυννόμενον ὅπερ πολλῶν*, ("which is poured out for many"). Luke in his turn contains

¹ Lietzmann, *op. cit.*, p. 179 invests the words *καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον* (Mk. 14:23, though admittedly secondary) with "objective significance" since he infers the passing of the wine round the table at the end of a common Jewish meal. He concludes: "...they give not only a correct description of the rite as performed by the churches round Mark, but also the import of the tradition on which the rite is based." The latter seems to me an unjustified conclusion.

both Pauline and Markan forms in the Lucan longer text
TO ὅτι ἐκχυνόμενον. The Lucan form agrees
with Paul to some extent since it adds the Pauline ὅτι
(Lk. 22:20; I Cor. 11:24) to the Markan ὅτι (Mk. 14:24).
But the Lucan text (Lk. 22:19b), closer to Paul (I Cor. 11:24)
than to Mark elaborates the words over the wine to be similar
to the words over the wine found in Mk. 14:24. Thus, Mk. 14:24
TO ΕΚΧΥΝΟΜΕΝΟΝ ὅτι πολλῶν, ("which is
poured out for many,") and Lk. 22:20 TO ὅτι ὅτι
ΕΚΧΥΝΟΜΕΝΟΝ, ("which is poured out for you").¹

A complete and accurate comparison of the three accounts
would be more complex than this. What we have done indicates
that the longer Lucan text is worded in a fashion similar
to both Mark and Paul. But I do not think it is possible
to draw a final conclusion on the basis of this fact. The
longer text of Luke may be an assimilation of the Markan and
Pauline accounts into one. On the other hand, Luke may
have known a tradition behind both Mark and Paul. This is
Jeremias' solution, but he thinks it is a liturgical
tradition, an interpretation which, in my opinion, is not
warranted.

If this were a process of assimilation it would be
understood as a secondary process taking place after all
three basic versions, (Mark, Luke, and Paul), were extant.

¹ Jeremias, op. cit., pp. 110, 112-112.

² Lietzmann, op. cit., pp. 175-177.

It could not then be understood as a primary process by which all three authors drew on the same or similar Passion Tradition. If, on the other hand, the three basic versions really did receive their original form independently from a common (perhaps liturgical) tradition the longer text of Luke might then be considered original.

Those words by which Jesus commanded the repetition of the Supper are found only in I Cor. 11:24 and the longer text of Luke (22:15-20). This brings us again to the question of authenticity of the longer text. Here again we run into disagreement between Jeremias and Lietzmann. The former holds to the authenticity of the longer text while the latter believes it is "unmistakably dependent" on I Cor. 11:24-25.¹ Although Jeremias once held that the longer text was secondary,² he now argues for its authenticity on the basis of overwhelming evidence from textual criticism.³ Against Jeremias' position is the fact that Luke 22:15-20 is neither the shorter nor the more difficult reading, a fact which violates two rules of textual criticism at once. Furthermore the longer text seems to be secondary to both Paul and Mark.⁴ But - and here is the capstone of Jeremias' argument - Luke 22:19-20 is a liturgical formula. This explains its similarity to Mark and Paul who evidently

¹ Lietzmann, op. cit., p. 175.

² Jeremias, op. cit., p. 100.

³ Ibid., p. 87f.

⁴ Ibid., p. 101.

know the same tradition. Jeremias, therefore, concludes that the longer text is "not a literary compilation from Mark and Paul but a 'third variation' on the liturgical formula ... showing an advance on Mark and Paul."¹ In the literary criticism of the three basic versions of the Lord's Supper, Mark is oldest, according to Jeremias, because of its Semitisms and Palestinian idioms.² Luke and Paul (the latter about 40 A.D.) both draw independently on a liturgical formula in use at Antioch.³ In regard to the words commanding repetition of the Supper, *ΤΟΥΤΟ ΠΟΙΕΙΤΕ ΕΓΙΣ ΤΗΝ ΕΜΗΝ ΑΝΑΜΝΗΣΙΝ* ("Do this in remembrance of me," (Lk. 22:19b, I Cor. 11:24, 25), there seems to be general agreement that these elements are secondary.⁴ This does not prove, however, as we have seen, that the Lucan longer text is itself a secondary text.

The purpose in this first chapter has been threefold. First, we set out to investigate the meaning of certain key words in the accounts of the Last Supper. Where else in the Bible do these words appear? What connotation do these passages have for the meaning of the Eucharist in the New Testament? Do any of these words approach a

I

¹ Ibid., p. 103.

² Ibid., p. 118.

³ Ibid., p. 131.

⁴ Ibid., p. 110, Taylor, *opM cit.*, p. 544-545, leaves the question open.

technical or sacramental usage at any point? The last question must be answered in the negative. Although it is clear that a knowledge of the background of each word enhances its meaning, in my opinion we are in a pre-technical era when we talk about the Eucharist in the New Testament. The use of such words as "element" to describe the food and "sacrament" to describe the action of the primitive Lord's Supper is a medieval anachronism. This point has been emphasized strongly in our discussion of the words "εὐλογητός" and "εὐχαριστήσιος". On the other hand, knowledge of the background of these words and others has yielded a rough idea of how the Eucharist developed from its earliest New Testament setting.

Our second aim was to give an account of the literary structure and form of the Last Supper accounts themselves. This discussion centered again on the words used to describe the Last Supper. There appear to be four basic aspects of the Last Supper accounts 1) the narrative settings 2) the actions of our Lord, 3) the words accompanying the actions, and 4) the words commanding repetition of the Supper. The relationship of the accounts of the Last Supper to the Passion Narrative was described as that of a discrete and self-contained section to a large, coherent block of tradition. By comparing the texts of the four Last Supper accounts, we attempted to describe the growth of the tradition. And

against those scholars who posited a pre-Markan liturgical formula, this student appealed to the primacy of the Passion Narrative (tradition) itself, and still further back the earliest recollections of Jesus' sayings. The question of the longer text of Luke has been an important one because its acceptance or rejection greatly increases or decreases the probability that Luke portrays a Passover setting for his account of the Last Supper. Yet I cannot make up my mind on this issue because of the conflicting evidence. Jeremias has shown that textual criticism strongly favors the longer text; whereas the comparison of the parallels leaves the impression that the longer text is a literary compilation of Markan and Pauline accounts.

Finally, the first chapter has picked up some clues as to the Eucharistic theology of the writers of the Last Supper accounts., The Gospel of Mark, which is our central interest, reveals a tendency to emphasize actions rather than words: taking, thanksgiving, breaking, giving. This tendency is set in relief by Matthew's apparent interest in what Jesus said. If the distribution is what matters in Mark, then the stage is set for the theme of sharing in fellowship with Our Lord and in the events which lead to his impending death and resurrection.

Our task in chapter two is to review some of the theories about the original context or setting of the Last Supper and to assess ~~them~~ credibility in the light of what we know of the Biblical background and New Testament times.

Chapter Two

The Earliest Setting of the Eucharist

Two aspects of Jewish religious practice are of immediate importance: the benedictions, Berakoth which are used at many points in worship but especially at Jewish meal times; and the Passover Seder. Both are important because of their closeness with the Last Supper and related passages.

The ordinary Jewish meal is begun with the washing of the hands as in Psalm 26:6;

I will wash my hands in innocency; so will
I compass Thine altar, O Lord.

This action became obligatory and was so strictly enforced by the Pharisees that anyone who did not so do was suspected of heresy, (Mt. 15:2; Mk. 7:3; Lk. 11:38), as in the case of Jesus and his disciples. The washing of the hands was the occasion for the first benediction:

Blessed art Thou, O Lord, King of the World,
who hast given us a command concerning washing
of the hands.

This was also the first benediction to be said in the morning. It was followed at meal time by a benediction over the bread:

Blessed ... who bringest forth bread from
the earth. (ps. 104:14).¹

After the meal a Benediction must be said if a man has eaten any of seven kinds of food, (Dt. 8:6: wheat, barley, grapes, figs, pomegranates, olive oil and [date] honey), but the man may choose the one for which he will say the

¹ A. Z. Idelsohn, Jewish Liturgy, 1932, p. 122.

Benediction (Berakoth 6:4)¹. He need not repeat a Benediction over the wine if he has said it before the meal, but he must say a Benediction over the bread after the meal in any case. (Berakoth 6:5). So much for rules applying to individuals.

The rules for groups of three or more have more relevance for our subject. If wine is brought to a group during the meal each should say the Benediction for himself; but if after the meal, one should say the Benediction for all... (from Berakoth 6:6). Let us see how well this rule applies to the Last Supper. If the wine was brought to Jesus and the disciples during the meal as the word *ἐπιπορεύτω*

(Mt. 26:26; Mk. 14:22), imply² the Benediction should have been said individually by each person present, (according to the above cited rule). That the Benediction was said by one for the many at the Last Supper may mean that the Last Supper did not conform to everyday custom.³ Or it may mean that the word *ἐπιπορεύτω* must be discounted; so that we can assume that Jesus spoke the Benediction over the cup because in fact the wine was brought *μετὰ τὸ δεῖπνον* (Lk. 22:20; ICor. 11:25)⁴. If the priority of the Lukan and Pauline texts

¹ Herbert Danby, The Mishnah, 1933, pp. 6-7.

² Jeremias, op. cit., pps. 26-27 thinks Mark (or the editor) is here "describing a sequence which differed completely from that of everyday." But this rule proves the situation was provided for in the Berakoth.

³ As Jeremias says, Ibid., p. 27.

⁴ Bauer, op. cit., p. 172 also cites Lk. 17:8.

is to be accepted in this case, we would picture an ordinary Jewish meal begun by the breaking of the bread¹ and followed with the distribution of the cup. But other factors must be considered before we can reach such a conclusion.

One such factor is the number of men² present at an ordinary Jewish meal compared to those who were at the Last Supper. If the number is greater than three, the Common Grace must be used, (Berakoth 7:1). It consists of a prayer of blessing offered in behalf of all present, a series of Benedictions by which the host bids the assembled company to give thanks to God for his gracious actions. The biddings of the host are answered by the responses of the company.³ The form of the Common Grace changes slightly as the number of the company increases from three upwards. In fact the ritual law makes special provision for the Common Grace to be offered when the following specified numbers of participants are present: three, to ten, to a hundred, to a thousand, to ten thousand! It would thus have been technically possible for the Common Grace to have been offered at the Feeding of the 4,000 and the 5,000 let alone the Last Supper! There is provision made in the Mishnah for just such situations. Therefore the argument that the number present at the Last Supper is applicable

¹ As Jeremias says, op. cit., p. 27. See also Idelsohn, op. cit., p. 122 for a description of the Benediction over the bread (as noted above in this paper).

² Women, slaves, or minors do not count in determining the form of table worship, i.e. whether the Common grace will be used (Berakoth 7:2).

³ For details see Idelsohn, op. cit.; pps. 123-124. Also Danby, op. cit., p. 8, (Berakoth 7:3).

only to the Passover and not to the common Jewish meal¹ is false.

In the light of the foregoing evidence about the Benedictions which take place at an ordinary Jewish meal, we can observe that the Last Supper is not technically excluded from being considered as an ordinary meal. The Mishna provides rules for the use of wine at ordinary meals. The Last Supper cannot therefore be considered a Passover meal because wine was used. Neither does the number of men present at the Last Supper indicate that it was a Passover Meal. The Mishna shows that the number of ten to twenty was specifically provided for in the religious observances around the ordinary table.² Finally, the point when the wine was offered is no problem in considering the Last Supper a common meal. We find from the study of the Mishna that wine could be offered either during or after the ordinary meal. But there is the problem of which text we will follow since Berakoth 6:6 is incompatible with the accounts of Matthew and Mark.

It is one thing to say that the Last Supper falls technically within the definition of an ordinary meal, but it is something quite different to say that there was nothing extraordinary about it. H. W. Beyer in his article on *εὐλογεῖν*³ points out that the Messiah

¹

Jeremias, op. cit., p. 19.

² For Jeremias' arguments on these two points see Ibid. pps. 18-19, 26-28.

³ Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, ed. G. Kittel, 1964, pps. 754-763.

faithfully carried out Jewish meal-time practices e.g. in the feeding of the 4,000 or 5,000. As we have noted before, the Lord takes the bread, gives thanks, breaks, and distributes it.

The only new feature is that in the prayer He does not look downwards as prescribed, but looks up to heaven. Perhaps the point of this is that these are not ordinary meals but miracles, and that He is seeking the help of God... . Perhaps he also rendered the benedictions in a freer form approximating, e.g., to the Lord's Prayer. (cit. Dalman) He must certainly have fused something of His own into the simple, everyday process of blessing and breaking bread, since otherwise the two on the way to Emmaus would not have recognized Him by this action (Lk. 24:30).¹

The glance toward heaven ἀναβλεψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν,

(Mk 6:41 par but not Mk 8:1-10 par), was certainly a distinctive mark of the Feeding of the 5,000. The phrase is not contained in the Last Supper accounts, but according to Lowrie, the Catholic liturgies retained it as the sole vestage of the banquet in the wilderness. In any case the looking up to heaven is evidently what made the breaking of the bread memorable when Jesus did it. And, (again according to Lowrie), the fact that this action was associated with the fractio panis meant that the phrase "the breaking of the bread" was "never used (by Christians?) except to denote the Eucharist."² This is an interesting suggestion although no evidence is presented for it from the early liturgies themselves. Even if the evidence could

¹ Ibid., p. 762.

² Lowrie, op. cit., p. 7.

be demonstrated, however; I think it is dangerous to impute the distinctiveness of Jesus' breaking of the bread to one particular action. On the other hand, this action does serve as a clue to the closer relationship of ordinary Jewish meal, feeding of the multitude, Last Supper and Eucharist. Whereas these various types are not the same they all manifest aspects of the same essential table fellowship.

As for Jesus' reworking the Benedictions, there is no doubt that close parallels exist between them and the Lord's prayer. These have been worked out in detail by Idelsohn.¹ It is probable that Jesus did impose his own form on these Benedictions, but how they came to their present form in the Lord's prayer is another question. Kohler has suggested that the original Benedictions were supplied by the Essenes and were reworked into their present form in the Lord's prayer by the early Christians.² We will discuss shortly the role of the Essenes in the development of the Lord's Supper itself.³ In any case, there is little difficulty in agreeing with Beyer and Lowrie that Jesus infused "something" recognizable (Lk. 24:30) into his table fellowship, but it is a fair question as to just what this "something" was. It must have characterized the Lord's Supper as well, since here

¹

Idelsohn, op. cit., pp. 307-308.

² Ibid., cites K. Kohler, "The Origins of Synagogue and Church," 1929, p. 240; H.U.C. Annual, I, p. 387f.

³ In K. G. Kuhn, "The Lord's Supper and the Communal Meal at Qumran," The Scrolls and the New Testament, ed. K. Stendahl, 1957, pps. 65-93.

Jesus repeats the taking, blessing, breaking, and distributing of the unleavened bread.¹ The unique factor

of the Lord's Supper may lie in the words of interpretation.²

But Paul recognized the uniquely Christian character of το ποτήριον
της ευλογιας (I Cor. 10:16) by adding the phrase
ο ευλογούμεν.³ Clearly the question of the uniqueness

of the Lord's Supper must be asked on two levels: that
of the early Christian Church and the Jesus level. But,
however close we may come to defining that something unique
in the New Testament references to the Eucharist, we will
probably come as near to it through the context of the
ordinary Jewish meal as through the Passover. Let us now
turn to an examination of the Passover Seder to see if
this statement holds up.

The 11th century Passover Seder (order) described by
Idelsohn is adapted for the following presentation.⁴

I. The Paschal Food

1. Three Matzoth covered. Two represent the "double
portion" (Exod. 16:22), while the third symbolizes the
"Bread of affliction" (Deut. 16:3).

2. A roasted shank-bone of a lamb-zeroa- in commemoration
of the Paschal lamb.

3. A roasted egg, commemorating the festival offering -
hagiga.

4. A piece of horseradish - Maror - and a dish of cut
horseradish.

1

Beyer, op. cit. pps. 762-763.

2 As Beyer suggests following Jeremias, op. cit., p. 41.

3 Beyer, op. cit., p. 763 cites A. Schlatter, Paulus der
Bote Jesu, 1934, p. 295f, "The Thanksgiving applies to the
cup because through it the congregation is blessed." By
it, it "participates in the blood of Christ."

4 Jewish Liturgy, Ch. XIV.

5. Haroseth - made of fruit, nuts, cinnamon, and wine, symbolizing the clay of Egypt.

6. Carpas - parsley or watercress.

II. "Ceremonial"

1. "A cup of wine is placed at each plate, and a large goblet of wine in the center of the table - called 'the cup of the prophet Elijah.'"

2. Cushions are provided for each seat so that all can partake in a reclining position, the symbol of free men in ancient Rome.

3. Everybody drinks four cups of wine.¹

III. The Passover Seder

(abbreviated order known since 11th century).

Kaddesh - Recite the Kiddush (benediction over wine)

Urehatz - wash the hands

Cappas - partake of parsley dipped in salt water, (benediction over "fruit of the earth.")

Yahatz - break middle Matza and hide one part which is to be eaten at the end of the meal as the Aphikomom

(2nd cup of wine filled; recitation of Haggada begins.)

Maggid - tell the story of Israel's deliverance from Egyptian bondage. (after the reading, the 2nd cup is drunk).

Rahatza - wash the hands for the meal (benediction - "who commanded us [to wash] our hands.")

Motzi, Matza - Recite the blessing over Matza and over bread - (benedictions over bread and thanks to Lord (2))

¹ The 4 cups are determined by the four promises of redemption made to Israel (Exod. 6:6-7): ... Bringing out of bondage, Deliverance from servitude, Redemption from all dependence on Egypt, and Selection as the people of God.

The reason for the cup of Elijah is that on Passover eve Elijah is supposed to announce the redemption. Originally, however, the fifth cup was ordered for Elijah to decide its legality, since ~~he will decide all doubts on religious matters.~~ In the Talmud, a fifth cup was demanded for the recitation of the "great Hallel" - Psalm 136..."

Maror - Partake of the bitter herb, and recite the benediction.

Corech - Combine Matza, Maror, and Haroseth and eat them together

Shulham orech - Partake of the meal

Tzafun - conclude meal by eating hidden Aphikomom
(third cup filled)

Barech - Say grace

Hallel - Recite the remainder of Hallel. Ps. 115-118, 136

4th Cup drunk after benedictions over wine. Then another benediction said.

Nirtza - Pray for the acceptance of the service.

While admitting some misgivings about the use of the materials, (Idelsohn's version of the Seder dates from only the 11th century), it is possible to make some observations about the form and content of the Passover Seder. It consists of a retelling of the story Haggada, of Israel's Exodus from Egypt (Exod. 12)¹, and the eating of the Passover meal. These two central actions are embellished by a special grace, Kaddesh, and benedictions, e.g. Motzi before the story is told and the meal is eaten; by certain ritual preparations of the body, Urehatz, Rahatza and of the food, Yahatz. The meal itself is also preceded by symbolic hors d'oeuvres, appetizers, or side dishes - Carpas, Maror, Corech. And it is followed by a kind of symbolic dessert,

¹

Idelsohn, op. cit., p. 173.

Tzafum, by a special grace, Barech, Hymns of Praise, Hallel, and a final prayer Nirtza.

The themes of the Passover meal, so variously interpreted, are perhaps best summed up as the remembrance and reenactment of Israel's suffering and deliverance i.e. a present participation in God's great scheme of redemption.¹ We are already making a comparison with the Christian Eucharist when we say that Passover is not simply a memorial of the past but a modern taking-part. At Passover this theme of present-day participation is emphasized by the telling of the Haggada to the children, in accordance with the Biblical ordinance:

"And thou shalt tell thy son on that day, saying: It is because of that which the Lord did for me when I came forth out of Egypt." (Exod. 13:8)²

The father retells the story as a first hand experience, (note the use of the first person), both as an individual and as the member of the Jewish community.

The retelling, Haggada, presupposes the child's questions which the celebration of the feast is designed to provoke. Thus the child is to ask why this night is different from other nights in that seasoned foods are eaten not once (as on other nights) but twice; in that

¹ C. K. Barrett, New Testament Backgrounds, 1961, p. 150,155 cites the eschatological theme in Passover: "it pointed forward to a future act of deliverance by God, that is it was eschatological, as well as commemorative."

² Idelsohn, op. cit., p. 174 (my italics)

unleavened bread only is eaten on this night; whereas both leavened bread and unleavened bread may be eaten on other nights; and in that (Lamb's) flesh is eaten roasted only on this night; whereas on other nights flesh may be eaten roasted, stewed or cooked.¹ In the answers the father draws on the tradition e.g. Deut. 26:5-9, "a wandering Aramean was my father..."².

The total impression one receives of the Passover Seder is of a feast celebrated by the family identifying itself with the greater Israelite Community in a mood of both solemnity and joy. It is a special occasion and a special meal, but it has its reference point in the customary fellowship of the Jewish family at ordinary meals (note the comparison of Passover to ordinary meals in the child's questions). It celebrates a special occasion in history, but it identifies the contemporary participant and draws him into the stream of history. It is celebrated by both adults and children. Its great theological themes of deliverance, redemption, and future fulfillment are expressed in practical everyday actions.

Such a summary statement cannot fail to unearth certain important problems in regard to Passover. Some of these problems can only be stated in the following questions. Is Passover mainly a family feast or mainly a community

¹ C.K. Barrett, op. cit., p. 156, Pesahim 10. 1c3ff., Danby, op. cit., p. 150. Since the destruction of the temple in more modern additions the question about roast meat has been replaced by the question about the reclining position of the participants. See Maurice Samuel, trans. Haggadah of Passover, Hebrew Publishing Company, New York, 1942, p. 9.
² Ibid.

celebration? To what extent are the children important? What is its relation to the ordinary Jewish meal, to other Jewish feasts and meal customs? What is the meaning of the Passover celebration? It seems to me that these are some of the questions hidden behind the questions which New Testament scholars ask about the Passover's relation to the Lord's Supper. There is not much agreement among them as to the nature of the Passover meal. In fact we will soon see in examining the arguments of Jeremias, Lietzmann, and Kuhn, that they tend to interpret the Passover either to fit, (Jeremias), or to be incompatible with, (Lietzmann), the New Testament accounts of the Lord's Supper. Even Kuhn, who does not deal directly with the Passover, might not argue so strongly for the influence of the Essene Community Meals on the primitive Lord's Supper if he saw the Passover as a community meal. We will keep these questions about Passover in mind as we discuss its relation to the Lord's Supper and the Supper's relation to other meal customs of the New Testament times.

In order to set up the debate let us discuss the positions first of those who claim that the Last Supper was a Passover meal. Jeremias following Dalman¹ states the reasons for assigning a paschal character to the Last Supper and then deals with the objections. Jeremias' reasons for the paschal theory may be summarized as follows.

¹ Jesus-Jeshua, 1929, pp. 86-184.

First comes the chronological problem. It rests in the differences between the Gospel of John and the Synoptics as to the date of Passover in the year of Jesus' death. The Synoptics say that the Last Supper was a Passover and took place on the night of the 14/15th of the month of Nisan. Thus Mk. 14:12 declares that the disciples raided the question of where their Passover would be eaten "on the first day of Unleavened Bread when they sacrificed the Passover lamb."¹ Thus the disciples asked Jesus on the very day of Passover itself, (it started in the evening), where they might partake of the Paschal meal. Although Mk. 14:12 may be regarded as a later expansion,² Lk. 22:15, which alludes to Jesus' earnest desire to eat the Passover with his disciples, is an independent, separate tradition.³ Thus the Paschal character of the Last Supper is supported

¹ Jeremias, op. cit., pp. 2-3. Although the 14th of Nisan is only called the first day of the feast in exceptional cases, the second phrase is meant to interpret the first. This is characteristic of Mark when he gives two time references, (15:42; 1:35; 16:2; 14:30; 4:35; 13:24).

² Ibid., p. 64-65.

³ Ibid.

by Luke if not by Mark.

Contrary to the Synoptics, John says that the Last Supper took place on the day of Preparation, i.e. the 14th Nisan. John 18:28 declares "... (the Jews) themselves did not enter the praetorium, so that they might not be defiled, but might eat the Passover." The crucifixion according to John must have taken place on the night before Passover. This is in direct contradiction to the Synoptic contention that the entire Passion Narrative falls on the night of Passover.¹

Now, if at all, can this basic contradiction be resolved? Jeremias discusses three main possibilities, attempts at harmonization of the Synoptics and John. 1) The Synoptists are right and John should be interpreted accordingly. This argument rests on the reinterpretation of the word pascha in Jn. 18:28 to mean "pashhal sacrifices" rather than paschal lamb.² But as Dalman points out:

No reader of the Johannine Passage could have understood the words 'eating of the Passover' to mean anything but the Passover lamb itself; and not Jew, if the author of the Fourth Gospel was one, would have transferred an expression used of a definite legal duty to something else.³

This attempt at harmonization falls down because of its lack of credibility.

¹ Ibid., p. 1. Both John and the Synoptics agree, however, that Jesus died on a Friday, (Mk. 15:42; Mt. 27:62; Lk. 23:54; Jn. 19:31, 42)

² Jeremias, op. cit., p. 5-6, is anticipated by Dalman, op. cit., p. 86 and Th-Zohn.

³ Dalman, op. cit., pp. 87-88.

2) John is right and the Synoptists should be interpreted accordingly. This hypothesis claims that Jesus kept a private Passover one day early, i.e. on the evening of the 14th of Nisan, but the evidence of Mk. 14:12 and par. and the impossibility of any private anticipation of Passover according to Jewish law ~~dis~~credits this suggestion.¹

Chwolson's theory that there were two Passover celebrations because the Festival coincided with the Sabbath is one basis for the third attempt at harmonization.

3) Both the Synoptists and John are right. If it were true that Passover were celebrated on two consecutive days in the year of Jesus' death so as to avoid the coincidence of Passover and Sabbath then both the dating of the Paschal meal on the evening of the day of preparation (John) --the night of Nisan 13th/14th - and on the evening of the day of Passover² (the Synoptists) - Nisan 14th/15th - could be correct. Unfortunately for the harmonizers, Chwolson's theory cannot be upheld for several reasons. According to Rabbinic principle "the Passover abrogates the Sabbath, i.e. makes the work in connection with the duties of the Passover obligatory even when it falls on a Sabbath."³ Thus the Paschal lamb could have been killed on a Sabbath, (contra Chwolson). Furthermore, even if the day of Passover had

¹

² Jeremias, op. cit., p. 7 n. 2.

³ The Sabbath would be considered over by sundown.

³ Dalman, op. cit., p. 89.

fallen on a Sabbath, the killing of the lamb would only have needed to have been brought forward a few hours until c. 2:00 p.m. on Nisan 14th not all the way to the preceeding evening -- Nisan 13th/14th.¹ And it was the custom for the killing to be done at this time anyway. If the lambs had been killed on the night of Nisan 13th/14th, however, they could not possibly have been held over until the following night. (ex. 12:10).²

Even though the coincidence of Passover with the Sabbath is not sufficient ground for the celebration of two Passovers, the two Passover theory can be supported by two other conjectures. 1) The necessity of two Passovers may be explained as the result of difference between the Pharisees and Sadducees over the day of the week on which Passover fell in the year of Jesus' death. The Pharisaic calculation of the date one day earlier than the Sadducaic would correspond to the Synoptic chronology which says Jesus died on Passover. The Sadducees' dating one day later than the Pharisaic would correspond to the Johannine chronology which says Jesus died on the day before Passover. This conjecture has been advanced by Billerbeck in particular "with so much circumspection and forethought that its possibility cannot be denied."³ 2) The suggestion that there were too many people in Jerusalem at Passover for one celebration to have been practical falls down for lack of

¹ Jeremias, op. cit., p. 8.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid., p. 9.

evidence according to Jeremias.¹ Thus even these two conjectures are at best a shaky basis for positing two Passover celebrations. And finally all the attempts to harmonize the Synoptic and Johannine chronologies fall down.

It seems that we have in the Synoptics and John two irreconcilable datings of Passover. But there is one other avenue of approach to this problem: that of astronomical dating. There are two problems with this method. In the first place leap months had to be added to the Jewish lunar calendar -- as many as seven in eighteen years-- in order to make the lunar and solar years correspond. This makes exact calculation difficult. In the second place each month was calculated by the Jews as the appearance of the new light which could be seen one or two days after the New Moon, (which itself was not visible). The problem is whether the new light was always seen when it was physically possible to see it. Astronomy cannot account for atmospheric conditions. These two problems are greatly reduced by two Jewish calendar rules: 1) Passover must not be celebrated before the Spring Equinox; and 2) no month may be less than 29 days or more than 30 days. The problem is reduced, therefore, to calculating whether the 14th Nisan or the 15th Nisan fell on a Friday (the day Jesus died). Taking into account the probable years of Jesus' death, Jeremias summarizes the

¹ Ibid., p. 10. The evidence from Josephus deals with the Jews of the dispersion.

results as follows:

... Nisan the 15th probably fell on a Friday in the years A.D. 30 and 34, and possibly in A. D. 27, and these are therefore the years which agree with the Synoptists. Nisan the 14th possibly fell on a Friday in the years A.D. 27 and 33, and perhaps in A. D. 30, which agree with John's chronology.¹

If Jesus died in the year 30, which is probable, Nisan 15 probably, (but not certainly), fell on a Friday. It is less probable that Jesus died in the year 33, but if so, Nisan the 14th probably fell on a Friday. Jeremias concludes;

Astronomical calculation is therefore unable to furnish us with an unquestionable result. It is, however, important that these astronomical calculations lend a certain limited probability to the chronology of the Synoptists, and thus to the paschal character of the Last Supper.²

One would have to agree, however, that the astronomical probability of the Synoptic dating is very limited.

Since we have not been able to harmonize the accounts or to explain the discrepancy between the two chronologies with strict accuracy only one avenue of approach remains open. We must discredit either the Synoptic or the Johannine chronology. Dalman attempts to show that the Johannine chronology altered the actual, (Synoptic), course of events for special reasons., In the first place, John records no Words of Institution, (Last Supper account). He

¹Ibid., p. 12
²Ibid., p. 13

omits them for two reasons: 1) because the Evangelist's theology of the Eucharist is a highly spiritualized one and 2) because John wanted to avoid misunderstanding as to the nature of the meal. Therefore John has Jesus describe himself as the Bread of Life, (Jn. 6:35; 41, 48, 53). That Jesus spoke (v. 53) of the necessity of eating his flesh and drinking his blood is proof of the spiritual meaning which he assigned to the bread and wine. The disciples could not have accepted such sayings otherwise. Whenever these spiritual sayings proved hard (v. 60) for them Jesus explained the difference between flesh and spirit:

It is the spirit that gives life, the
flesh is of no avail; the words that I
have spoken to you are spirit and life.

Jn. 6:63

That the Evangelist has Jesus explain the reality in this way is a testimony both to Johannine theology and to necessity according to Dalman. John wanted to emphasize the Person of Christ and "the spiritual possession of God's grace and truth in Jesus."¹ Moreover he wanted to avoid the charge of cannibalism from the Hellenistic side of the church and of violation of the law from the Jewish side. But his purpose was not only polemical; he also wanted to guard the sacred mysteries as revealed in the Words of Institution from profanation.² John therefore, omitted

¹

² Dalman, op. cit., p. 91.

Jeremias, op. cit., p. 86.

the Words of Institution entirely. And by so doing, he eliminated the need for a Passover meal as a setting for the Words.¹ He could not, however, suppress the tradition of the Last Supper on Passover.² So he simply solved this difficulty by moving the Last Supper back one day before Passover. To an author with John's particular theological emphases and apologetic problems, Dalman concludes, "this method did not seem wrong."³

As for the Paschal significance of the crucifixion in John, Dalman points out that it rests on Jn. 19:14 which refers not to Our Lord's death but to his rejection by the Jews.

It seemed to (John) of importance to note that the Jews at the sixth hour of the Passover Eve rejected their King and demanded that he should be crucified. Thus to St. John, although there was a connection between Our Lord and the Scripture concerning the Passover lamb, the relation was not to that which the Jews slaughtered and ate.⁴

This is a rather tricky point in that Dalman still allows Christ to be described as the Passover Lamb. It is consistent with his thesis that the Last Supper was a Passover meal. Thus Christ would represent the Passover lamb in the "New Passover" (Eucharist) of the early Christians. But what Dalman's argument boils down to is an attempt to discredit the Johannine chronology on the basis of the Johannine polemic. And this is pure conjecture. We do not know that John distorted the

¹ Dalman, op. cit., p. 91.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid., p. 9a

facts to suit his own purposes. Evidence for this suggestion is lacking.

So there is no way of establishing the "right" chronology of events in the Passion Narrative, and therefore, we cannot say from a purely chronological point of view that the Last Supper was a Passover Meal. External evidence, so to speak, has been exhausted. What about internal evidence? Jeremias has marshalled ten points of comparison between the Last Supper and the Passover to prove the Paschal character of Our Lord's last meal with his disciples. The ten points may be summarized as follows:

1. The Last Supper took place in Jerusalem according to the rule that the Passover had to be eaten within the gates of the city.
2. The Last Supper took place at night, a meal-time customary for Jews only at Passover.
3. The number present at the Last Supper - the twelve - fits the rule governing Passover.
4. Jesus and his disciples reclined at the Last Supper according to Passover custom.
5. The fact that Jesus broke bread during the course of the meal differs from everyday Jewish custom and conforms to Passover custom.
6. Jesus and his disciples drank wine at the Last Supper. Wine was reserved for festal occasions and Passover. Also the wine they drank was red wine as at Passover.
- 7.. Judas' exit from the table may have been interpreted by the disciples as his being sent to give something to the poor, (Jn. 13:29), as was the Passover custom.
8. The Last Supper ended with the singing of a hymn corresponding to the Passover Hallel.
9. Gethsemane was within the district of greater Jerusalem established to accommodate the Passover Pilgrims.

10. Jesus' words of interpretation over the bread and wine correspond to the words of the Pater familias over the Passover food.

Jeremias' arguments are compelling, and the evidence he marshalls is impressive. But an important counter-view has been put forth in which five of Jeremias' points are seriously challenged by Kuhn.¹

Kuhn's purpose is to prove that the "formula of institution" (as he calls the passages under discussion):

describes the Last Supper not as a Passover meal but as a communal meal, the forms of which correspond to those of the cult meal of the Essenes.²

This is not to say that the Last Supper is to be identified with the Essene cult meal, but certain influences are to be traced.

Some of these points of contact between the Last Supper and the Essene cult meal will appear as we discuss Kuhn's differences with Jeremias. In reference to Jeremias' above arguments in favor of the Lord's Supper as a Passover meal Kuhn brings the following arguments.

- Point 2. In I Cor. 11:23, Paul's reference to "the night on which he was betrayed," refers to the literary context of the formula in the Passion Narrative as it is known to Paul. It should not be used to prove that the Last Supper occurred at nighttime.
- Point 3. Those present at the Last Supper constituted a communal fellowship of the chosen disciples around their Teacher as at Qumran.
- Point 4. The blessings over the bread and wine in immediate sequence during the meal reflects the usage of the *Qumran Community*.

¹ "The Lord's Supper and the Communal Meal at Qum Ran", The Scrolls and the New Testament, ed. K. Stendahl, pps. 65-93.

² Ibid., p. 85.

Point 6. The use of wine could also indicate the Essene meal. Moreover, though red wine was not uncommonly used in Palestine, we have no evidence that red wine was used at the Last Supper.

Point 10. Jesus' words over the bread and wine have nothing to do with the Haggada. The interpretation of the Passover feed is restricted "to those elements which make the Passover meal different from other meals." Bread and wine would not fall under this rubric. The purely formal similarity of the words of interpretation to the Passover words does not prove the Last Supper was a Passover.

Of Jeremias' remaining arguments, points 1 and 9 may be classed as circumstantial since they have to do with place. Jesus' presence with his disciples at Jerusalem may only have been coincidental with the Passover not dependent on it as Jeremias says. The relevance of point 9 concerning Gethsemane is also coincidental.¹ Both arguments 1 and 9 rest on the assumption that the Last Supper was a Passover meal. It seems to me that if this assumption is true, the presence in Jerusalem and at Gethsemene follow as logical consequences, but they would not stand up in court, so to speak, as prima-facie evidence.

The reference to Jn. 13:29 in the discussion of point 7, Judas' exit, is strange in that, as we have seen, the Johannine chronology places the Last Supper one day before Passover. It is odd that Jeremias, who has outlined the chronological problem so clearly should support his thesis on the basis of a Johannine passage. On the other hand,

¹ Jn. 18:2 says in part "... Jesus often met there" i.e. in the garden, "with his disciples."

Jeremias himself would undoubtedly answer that the Johannine chronology is no obstacle to the paschal character of the Last Supper.¹ According to him Jn. 13:1 and 19:14 are not decisive evidence for the Johannine chronology, and consequently he sees the Johannine and the synoptic time tables side by side in the Gospel of John. The whole basis for John's special chronology according to Jeremias, (contra. Dalman), is to make Jesus' death coincide with the death of the paschal lamb.² May we conclude, then, that Jn. 13:29 is a Synoptic element in John?

Some thought that because Judas had the money box, Jesus was telling him "Buy what we need for the feast"; or, that he should give something to the poor.

(Jn. 13:29)

Judas was to buy what was needed for the feast which sounds as though it were a preparatory measure i.e. corresponds to John's dating. But the giving to the poor sounds as though it were a Passover custom i.e. according to the Synoptic chronology. The possibility that the disciples' double conjecture about where Judas was going has a double origin, (in John and in the Synoptics), cannot be conclusively denied, as far as I know. Neither has it been proved, to my knowledge; at least not by Jeremias.

Point 7 concerning the singing of the hymn is supported in the section, The Way to Gethsemane: Peter's

¹ Jeremias, op. cit., pp. 55-56.

² Ibid., see Dalman, op. cit., p. 92.

Denial Prophesied, (Mk. 14:26; Mt. 26:30 but not in Lk. 22:39):

καὶ ὑμνησάντες ἔξῃλθον
εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἑλαιῶν. Mk. 14:26; Mt. 26:30

καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἐπορεύθη κατὰ
τὸ εἶδος εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἑλαιῶν
ἠκολούθησαν δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ
μαθηταί.

Lk. 22:39

According to Bultmann, Mk. 14:26 with its ὑμνησάντες is a narrative link with vv. 12-16, The Preparation for the Passover. But v. 26 need not be taken as an original part of the pericope since vv. 27-31 could originally have stood independently of v. 26. Lk. 22:39 is a different setting from v. 26, a fact which argues further for the latter's secondary character.¹ Luke at least seems to have known another tradition or have seen fit to alter what for him was not central to the purpose of the pericope. Such form critical observations need not detract however from Jeremias' argument that ὑμνησάντες refers to the Passover Hallel. Mark obviously thought it was important to emphasize that Jesus and the disciples had sung a hymn. On the other hand, the question may be opened as to whether Mk. 14:26 and par. is original, i.e. whether it represents the oldest tradition of what actually took place at the Last Supper.

¹ R. Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition, 1963, pp. 266-267.

At this point it would be well to summarize the discussion as to the paschal character of the Lord's Supper. By his assumption that the communal meal of the Essenes influenced the Lord's Supper, Kuhn has countered five of Jeremias' arguments in favor of the Last Supper as a Passover meal. And with Bultmann's help, we have been able to cast doubt on the remaining five. This exercise is not to be taken as an attempt to discredit Jeremias. His scholarship is far too thorough to be circumvented so easily. Two observations, however seem appropriate at this point. One is the common thought that the whole is more than the sum of its parts. No one of Jeremias' arguments may be conclusive in itself, but taken as a whole, their weight is considerable. Another observation to be kept in mind is that most of the important scholars on the nature of the primitive Last Supper begin from different starting points. And these starting points will be determinative of the analysis that follows.

Jeremias is steeped in the Old and New Testaments themselves and the Talmud; therefore he decides that the Last Supper belongs to the tradition of the most ancient Jewish feast, Passover. Kuhn is an authority on Qumran; therefore he finds parallels to the Last Supper in the Essene communal meals. And as we shall see, Lietzmann finds two types of Eucharists developing at the earliest stages because he has

already discerned and classified two types among the early liturgies on which he is an authority. So also, Cullmann, a scholar of the resurrection¹ in the New Testament, believes that the resurrection theme is central to the primitive Lord's Supper. Similarly Bultmann's view that the Last Supper is an aetiological cult legend developed by early Christianity in order to explain the primitive Lord's Supper which evolved in the Hellenistic Christian Church, can be traced to his scholarly involvement with the Hellenistic Church and his preoccupation with form criticism and the history of religions.

It is not difficult to catalogue the various views although it is harder to criticize any one scholar within his special field. It should be kept in mind, however, that none of these views overlaps entirely or even substantially with the others. And so it is not always possible to assess the credibility of an argument accurately. If each scholar's starting point is kept in view, however, we are more likely to understand his reasoning and viewpoint. In short we will be better equipped if we remember that each scholar is apt to find what he is looking for.

Let us summarize the main points of difference between Jeremias and Kuhn and then move on to the theories of the other above-mentioned scholars. As we have seen,

¹ He recently edited with Krister Stendahl, Immortality and Resurrection, 1965.

Jeremias depends on the Passover customs and the Jewish Law to support his contention;¹ whereas Kuhn refers to Qumran and Josephus more frequently. The sources are different but the method of argument is the same. Kuhn shows that the circumstances of the Last Supper do not permit the Passover interpretation:

1. The Passover meal was attended by a family group, but the Last Supper was eaten by the Lord and the twelve who cannot be considered a family group. On the contrary, the gathering shows the influence of the Essene cult fellowship where only the men of the inner circle, full members of the order, were allowed to take part and where the priest or leader presided, not the pater familias.²

2. The second point has to do with the blessings over the bread and wine. The fact is that Mark has two blessings side by side at the beginning of the meal unlike the Passover custom of blessings at the beginning and end of the meal. This fact is explained by Kuhn as an influence of the Essene communal meal in which the priest blesses the bread and wine before the meal begins.³

Jeremias implies that Jesus thought of his disciples as his "family" (which is questionable). But it is perhaps

¹

Jeremias, op. cit., pp. 49-53 shows that the following events could have taken place on Passover according to Torah and Talmud.

1. The arrest at Gethsemane.
2. The carrying of arms by temple guards and disciples.
3. The trial and condemnation of Jesus by the Sanhedrin (Dt. 17:8).
4. The tearing of the high priest's robe at court.
5. Jewish participation in the Roman court.
6. The arrival of Simon of Cyrene.
7. Participation of the Jews in the execution of Jesus.
8. The purchase of a shroud in which the body was laid.
9. The taking down of the body, burial, and rolling of the stone across the mouth of the tomb, (Dt. 21:23).
10. The preparation of ointments and spices.

²

Kuhn, op. cit., pp. 83-84.

³ Ibid., p. 67, cites IQS vi, 1-6,; p. 71, cites IQS vii, 17-22. According to Kuhn (p. 84) it was common custom both at Passover and at the ordinary Jewish meal for the guest of honor to say the final blessing over the wine. But in Mark and Matthew Jesus says both blessings as was the custom of the leader at Qumran.

significant that in Mk. 3:31-35 and par. Jesus refers to "those who sat about him" as "my mother and my brothers!" in deliberate denial of the claims of his natural family. That Mark and par. represent Jesus as generalizing his idea of family to include all the faithful is clear from the saying attributed to the Lord:

Whoever does the will of God is my brother,
and sisters and mother. (Mk. 3:35)

Nevertheless, Kuhn has raised a telling criticism of the Passover theory, for we cannot be sure that the idea of Mk. 3:31-35 and par. is operative in Mk. 14:22-25 and par.

Even more significant is the difference between Jeremias and Kuhn over the blessings. Jeremias holds that the fact that the synoptics are silent about the Passover ritual itself simply proves the preoccupation of the Synoptists with "the cultic ritual" of the early church.¹ But the fact that in spite of this preoccupation, the synoptics still contain so many clues to the paschal character of the Last Supper, is proof of the antiquity of the Passover tradition.

The early church did not celebrate the Eucharist according to the Passover ritual... . Therefore if the Synoptists nevertheless describe the Last Supper as a Passover, with no attempt at concealment, the reason is obviously that the recollection of the fact was so firmly established that it could not be removed even by the established ritual.²

The very incidental character of the Passover tradition argues strongly for its authenticity according to Jeremias;

¹ Jeremias, op. cit., p. 42.

² Ibid., p. 37.

whereas the lack of explicit reference to the Passover ritual is used by other scholars to prove the lack of a Passover tradition, e. g. Lietzmann and Kuhn.

In accordance with his assumption that the Passover ritual actually took place between the blessings, Jeremias explains the omission of the ritual in the Synoptics by reference to ritual of the early church, (see above). He can, therefore, conclude that the words accompanying the bread and wine and the command to repeat the rite came before and after the main course of the Passover meal, i.e. "Jesus ... used the prayers before and after the main course of the Passover meal to add His Words of Institution over the bread and wine."¹ On the other hand, we have also seen that Kuhn makes no allowance for an invisible Passover ritual behind the present Markan pericope. For Kuhn, the Markan blessings are original as they stand:

... the immediate sequence of the blessings over the bread and the wine in Mark and Matthew reflects not a later Christian usage, but on the contrary, an earlier pre-Christian usage, namely, that of the Essene cult meal as we have it in the Qumran texts.²

The reason Paul and Luke represent the blessings before and after the meal, according to Kuhn, is that Paul and Luke followed the "common Jewish usage of blessing before and after the meal." They did not understand the older Markan liturgical formula which was strongly influenced by Essene practice.³ The Pauline and Lukan texts of the Last Supper

¹ Jeremias, op. cit., p. 60, uses "Words of Institution" at this point in a specialized sense meaning the words accompanying the bread and wine and the command to repeat the rite. In this paper, we refer to the entire account of the Last Supper as "the Words of Institution".

² Kuhn, op. cit., p. 73.

³ Ibid.

therefore, follow common Jewish meal custom rather than Essene meal custom.

Here then are crucial form critical considerations on which Kuhn and Jeremias differ. What was the original setting of the Words of Institution? How is it preserved in the Markan text? Jeremias, of course, posits a Passover setting as original to the Words of Institution. This setting has ~~not~~ been preserved in the Markan text, (14:22-25). It once consisted of a Passover ritual between the two blessings, (i.e. between vv. 22 and 23), but this Passover ritual has already been suppressed in Mark due to the influence of the early church. Kuhn's answer is that the original setting to the Words of Institution is "a common meal, the forms of which correspond to those of the cult meal of the Essenes."¹ This setting still exists in the Markan text in the sequence of the blessings (vv. 22 and 23). This sequence corresponds to the sequence of the blessings said by the priest or leader at the Essene cult meal, i.e. one after another at the beginning of the meal.²

It is now possible to outline the stages in the development of the Eucharistic tradition from a form-critical point of view.

1. Jesus speaks a double logion, a twin parable which interprets his impending death as substitutionary atonement

¹ Ibid., p. 85.

² Kuhn, op. cit., p. 88, is no literalist about the Markan text. He follows Jeremias in thinking it preserves a pre-Markan cult formula. They differ only as to the original setting of Jesus' double logion before it became associated with the cult meal of the church.

for all men.¹

2. This parable was told at Jesus' last meal in a certain setting, Sitz in Leben, as part of a Passover meal, a communal meal after the fashion of the Essenes, an ordinary Jewish meal, or some other possibility.

3. After our Lord's death, his followers met daily to celebrate his resurrection by "a continuation of meal fellowship (which they had once enjoyed) with the historical Jesus as it is portrayed in the stories of Jesus' feeding the multitudes (Mk. 6:35ff; 8:1ff pars; cf. the meal at Emmaus, Lk. 24:30ff.)² This common meal was not yet associated with the Last Supper or the twin parable. Its mood was that of exultation in the resurrection and eschatological expectation, not remembrance of Our Lord's death and Passion. It constituted a separate type of meal from that which later developed from the Last Supper.³

4. At some point - we do not know when or by whom⁴ - the last meal of Jesus with his disciples emerged as a new type of fellowship meal, a Eucharist, in which Jesus' double logion became a cultic formula. At this point the twin parable became what is meant by "Words of Institution."⁴

¹ Jeremias, op. cit., p. 145 is followed by Kuhn, op. cit., p. 85.

² Ibid., p. 86.

³ Lietzmann, op. cit., p. xii, cf. p. 204, believes that the fellowship meals, (later called agape), were merely a continuation of Jesus' ordinary meals in his life on earth. In fact, the Last Supper was such an ordinary meal which was later reinterpreted as a Eucharist by Paul.

⁴ Lietzmann, Ibid, thinks Paul himself was the author of this identification of the fellowship meal and the Last Supper. Cullmann, "The Meaning of the Lord's Supper in Primitive Christianity," Essays on the Lord's Supper, trans. J. G. Davies, 1958, p. 7 posits "a very concrete recollection" of the Last Supper already influencing the eschatological meal in the early church before Paul. Kuhn, op. cit., p. 89 agrees with Cullman that "Paul is not responsible for the combination" in that he "received" it as tradition, (I Cor. 11:23), and added to it the idea of "... participation in the body of Christ," (I Cor. 10:16f). Similarly, Jeremias, op. cit., p. 108 comments on the same passage, "So from the form of the introduction, (ΕΥ ΤΗ ΒΟΥΛΗ ΤΗΣ ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑΣ rather than ΚΑΙ ΕΤΙΜΟΝ ΤΩΝ ΑΓΙΩΝ), the absence of any historical detail not liturgically necessary, and the un-Pauline style, it follows that Paul was passing on an established liturgical formula." On the other hand, Moule, in Worship in the New Testament, 1961, pp. 21, 25-26 challenges Lietzmann's separation of the early fellowship meal and the primitive Eucharist. Following Jeremias' view that the Pauline and Lucan traditions are primitive traditions, Moule concludes that "...from the very first, 'the breaking of the loaf'...could always for the Christian have been associated with the covenant renewed by God in the death of Christ. (p25) 5Kuhn, op. cit., p. 88.

5. The rite of the Lord's Supper developed in the early church in the Didache, the Apostolic Traditions of Hippolytus, Justin's Apology and other records of the early liturgies. In these developments, the Words of Institution took various forms.¹

6. Taking a long leap, to the present day situation, attempts are being made to reinterpret the place and meaning of the Words of Institution in modern liturgies.²

Picking up the discussion at point 4 where the Last Supper became a Eucharist, we can see from the note on the preceding page that scholarly opinions differ widely as to how this process took place. The main issue seems to be whether we are to follow Lietzmann, Cullmann, and Kuhn in finding a separation of Eucharistic types within the New Testament itself, or whether we are to follow Moule's conclusion from Jeremias' evidence that there is a unity of Eucharistic tradition in the New Testament and that no separation is possible. In a sense, the question of united or separate origin is meaningless since eschatological and memorial tendencies obviously exist in the history of the Lord's Supper and can be recovered for our present-day understanding of the rite. Yet, on the other hand, this is the critical question because it determines whether contemporary discussion can move beyond the present confusion

¹ Lietzmann, op. cit., p. xii, traces the development as follows:

Type I. (Eschatological)

1. The habourah of the living Jesus and the Resurrection meals
2. Didache (IX-X)
3. The Egyptian type, represented by Serapion

Type II. (Memorial)

1. The Last Supper
2. The Pauline rite (I Cor. 11).
3. The Western Type represented by Hippolytus' Apostolic Tradition.

² This stage will be dealt with in the final chapter.

to a clearer picture of what the development of the Lord's Supper in the New Testament is.

On one level, the question of the origin of the tradition has been quite conclusively argued by Jeremias who posits Mark as the most original source of the Words of Institution. The Pauline and Lucan traditions, though separate, know of the tradition recorded in Mark; so that they actually support the Markan view of the Last Supper which, Jeremias argues, is a paschal view. The question as to the unity of the tradition seems to be solved at the literary-critical level.

On the other hand, critics such as Kuhn and Moule who follow Jeremias' general analysis disagree with him over the interpretation of the doublet to the longer text of Luke, (Lk. 22:19-20).¹ While all three parties are agreed that this doublet is original, Jeremias thinks its unLucan style is explained by the fact that it is a "third variation" of the liturgical formula in Mark and Paul.² Moule follows T. W. Manson in thinking that Luke ^U simply learned the liturgical phrase from Paul, i.e. (contra Jeremias) it is ~~is~~ literary compilation, but not "unhistorical" or "post-Lukan."³ And Kuhn thinks of vv. 19-20 as a tradition which is both a

¹ Jeremias, op. cit., p. 103.

² Ibid.

³ Moule, op. cit., p. 25 n. 1.

"third variation" and un-Lucan, i.e. a tradition competing with v. 19a and a tradition of a different origin from v. 19a.¹ It is strange that neither Moule nor Kuhn seem to make use of their hard won freedom from Jeremias' interpretation of the longer text to attack Jeremias' whole literary-critical analysis. But having affirmed the solidarity (Moule) or lack of solidarity (Kuhn) of the Pauline with the synoptic Eucharistic tradition, both scholars go on to make form critical judgments about the origin of the Lord's Supper. Moule, as we have seen, affirms that "the breaking of the loaf" was always associated with the new covenant in the death of Christ.² But Kuhn decides that the original Last Supper did not have a Passover setting.³ Neither judgment seems to be justified by literary-critical evidence. And it may be fair to say, therefore, that there is a certain hiatus between literary and form criticism on this question of Eucharistic origins. We may conclude that the question of one original type of Eucharist versus two types rests primarily on form critical rather than literary critical grounds.

"Historical stories and legends," according to Bultmann, "gain their point only when set into their context."⁴

¹

² Kuhn, op. cit., p. 82.

³ Moule, op. cit., p. 25.

⁴ Kuhn, op. cit., p. 82.

⁵ Bultmann, op. cit., p. 245.

This in itself is a significant form critical principle even though scholars differ widely, as we have seen, over just what the context of the Lord's Supper is. All the scholars mentioned so far except Bultmann¹ are convinced of a Palestinian origin and setting for the traditions of the Lord's Supper. But it would be well at this point to discuss two scholars who posit a different context from the Passover or the Essene cult meal, i.e. Lietzmann and Cullmann.

Although we have already dealt with Lietzmann's theory in other connections, it is important to clarify his main points before closing this chapter. In the first place, the original context of the Lord's Supper was the so-called habourah meal, a Jewish meal "invested with religious solemnity which might be held by a company of friends... whenever they felt the need." The Agape corresponds to such a meal, and the habourah is the "exact prototype of the last meal of Jesus with his disciples." ² Whether or not the Last Supper can actually be traced to the habourah meal, it is significant that Lietzmann finds the context of the Last Supper in a more or less ordinary Jewish meal custom outside the Paschal setting.

¹ Ibid. Bultmann classifies the Lord's Supper as a cult legend or aetiological cult legend, (p. 245 n.1), whose origin is in the Hellenistic church, cf. Kuhn, op. cit., p. 81.

² Lietzmann, op. cit., pp. 170-171; see Jeremias' telling criticisms, op. cit., pp. 25-26.

Lietzmann's two types of eucharistic traditions are not mutually exclusive as might be supposed. Both, for example, contain the idea of eschatological hope, and both types are shown to have grown up independently; so that each represents a valid tradition. Both types were also subject to Hellenistic additions although each was Palestinian in origin. The difference is that the type which Lietzmann calls the Jerusalem type was a continuation of the table-fellowship with the living Jesus. This meal began with the distributing of the bread. The so-called Pauline type, however, was a remembrance of the Lord's last meal and death. The distribution of the bread began the meal and the offering of the wine ended it. In the latter case the bread and wine were considered symbols of Christ's body and blood.¹

Lietzmann's own statements will help clarify his conceptions of the two types. First the Jerusalem type:

... as a Jewish habourah they gathered together around the Master for the common meal. The old "table fellowship" (Koinonia) which had begun in the time of the historic Jesus was continued with the risen Lord. One of the company at table pronounced the blessing over the bread in his stead; then, breaking it, he distributed it to the others and the meal began. The food was simple, they drank water, possibly very occasionally wine - for on those journeyings through the land they had learnt from the Master to be

¹ Lietzmann, op. cit., p. 207.

content with little. Not even a "cup of blessing" was passed round at the conclusion of the meal. Thus had it been formerly, when the Lord had presided at the table in the flesh. Now he was with his disciples "in the spirit", for where two or three were gathered together in his name there was he in the midst of them (Mt. 28:20). And soon, the community fervently believed, he would come again in the clouds of heaven, like Daniel's Son of Man, and set up the Messianic Kingdom on earth.¹

A certain flexibility is noticeable here in the choice of the second kind of food to be eaten or drunk with the bread.² The bread itself was the essential food at such a meal. The eschatological motif was especially strong in the Jerusalem Type. Thus "in answer to the 'Maranatha,' the 'Come, Lord Jesus' of their leader, the company at table hailed the longed-for Lord with glad hosannas."³

The Pauline type is found in the Pauline epistles, (I Cor. 11:23-25), and the Gospel of Mark, (14:22-25).

In this type the Supper is not the continuation of the daily 'table-fellowship' of the disciples with their Lord, but is connected only with a single one of such meals, and that the last. It is this meal and this alone, that is repeated by the community, and thus the Lord's Supper is a memorial of Christ's death. ...in re--enacting that meal the community was mindful of the prophecy of death and its fulfillment, but it proclaimed as well as the death, the resurrection and the imminently expected parousia of the Lord.⁴

¹ Ibid., p. 204.

² Cullmann, op. cit., pp. 10-11, refers to Eucharists in which bread was eaten alone or with water, salt, or fish; for refs. to fish see Lk. 24:42; Jn. 21.

³ Lietzmann, op. cit., p. 203, discusses Hellenistic additions.

⁴ Ibid., p. 205.

There is an exclusive character to this meal and a lack of flexibility. It is distinguished from all other meals and it follows the tradition of the Last Supper closely both in the food eaten and the words spoken. But it does contain a strong eschatological motif as well as the remembrance of the Lord's death. The Hellenistic church interpreted it as a mystery.¹

An important point of comparison among the scholars who follow Lietzmann methodologically is that they all agree² that the original context of both the table fellowship and the Last Supper was the ordinary Jewish meal.³ But all the scholars also think that there was something special about the Last Supper. It was a communal meal, but what is meant by this? Was it the community of the family at Passover, (Jeremias)? Or analogous to the Essene cult meal, (Kuhn)? Or a habourah meal, (Lietzmann)? Cullmann takes a much less antiquarian approach.⁴ Rather than trying to establish a type of the Eucharist in Jewish meal customs, Cullmann asserts:

That joy which, according to Acts 2:46, filled the hearts of the first believers united for the "breaking of bread" could not have been

¹

² Ibid., pp. 204-205.

³ contra Bultmann, op. cit., p. 245.

³ Lietzmann, op. cit., pp. 170-171; Cullmann, Op. cit., p. 10 says the Eucharist was in origin an ordinary meal; Kuhn, op. cit.; p. 81, declares, "the entire structure of the cult formula presupposes Jewish Meal customs... not ... the special Jewish Passover, but the Jewish meal in general." On the other hand, Moule, op. cit., p. 26 holds that the "sacramental" character of a Christian meal is determined by its reference to the death of Christ. Not every reference to the breaking of bread is, therefore, a reference to the Eucharist according to Moule.

⁴ Although he accepts Lietzmann's two types, Cullmann, op. cit., p.7.

elicited either by the recollection of the Last Supper or by the recollection of the daily meals taken with the Lord during his lifetime. These recollections, in effect, were rather of the kind to awaken feelings of nostalgia.¹

How, then, do we account for the mood of joy and gladness associated with the primitive eucharist? Cullmann finds the answer in the strong influence of Jesus' post-resurrection appearances on the primitive Eucharistic meals. "The certainty of the Resurrection, he says, was the essential religious motive of the primitive Lord's Supper."²

The fact of the "overflowing joy" ἀλλοτρίως of the participants at the early Christian meals is evident from Acts 2:42,46. And the connection between these primitive Eucharists and the post-resurrection appearances seems to be confirmed by Lk. 24:42-43 and certainly by Acts 10:41. One of Cullmann's strong points for the connection of the Eucharistic meal with the post-resurrection meal is his reference to the food eaten at these meals. In discussing Lietzmann's Jerusalem Type, we noted that Cullmann refers to various foods that could be eaten with the bread, especially salt and fish. Acts 1:3-4 may contain a reference to the disciples "taking salt together,"

συνάλας ἐμμενος .³

¹ Cullmann, op. cit., p. 8.

² Ibid., p. 12.

³ Cullmann, op. cit., pp. 11-12 argues that this word is derived from the substantive αλς i.e., salt.

Certainly fish is an Eucharistic symbol. The account of the feeding of the multitude in John 6 tells of the distribution of fish and serves as the context for Jesus' discourse on the Bread of Life, (beginning v. 25). This section is thought of by many as a commentary on the Eucharist.¹ Again in Lk. 24:42, Jesus consumes a "piece of broiled fish" as a proof to the unbelievers that is he who stands before them. Even more significant is John 21:1-14 where the miraculous catch of fish is reported coincident with a post-resurrection appearance by Our Lord.² Thus the eating of fish is closely linked with the presence of the Risen Lord (John 21:1-14) and the eschatological expectation of the Second Coming and Last Judgment (Rev. 3:20).³ In the perspective of the resurrection the theme of eschatological expectation is linked closely in the minds of most Christians with that of the resurrection joy and gladness. But our present perspective need not blind us to the fact that Our Lord inaugurated the eschatological event while he lived on earth. The feedings of the multitudes, (Mt. 14:13-21; 15:32-39; Mk. 6:30-44; 8:1-10; Lk. 9:10-17; Jn. 6:1-15), may well

¹ Dalman, op. cit., pp. 90-91.

² C. W. F. Smith, "Fishers of Men," The Harvard Theological Review, vol. LII, no. 3, July, 1959, pp. 197-203, claims the story has its original context, (Mk. 1:16-20; Mt. 4:18-22), in "connection ...with the inauguration of an eschatological event...(But) the Lukan narrative (Lk. 5:1-11) reflects the conversion of the eschatological call into a form more congenial to the post-pentacostal church," (p. 201). John 21:1-14, on the other hand, is clearly a resurrection story. (p. 199).

³ Ibid.

have been Messianic Banquets held in the period of Jesus' earthly life time to celebrate the inauguration of a new era, which had not yet, however, come to completion. The incompleteness of the eschatological event must be the reason why, according to John, Jesus avoided being made King at such a meal, (Jn. 6:15).

It is reasonable to suggest that Jesus' daily table-fellowship - the ordinary "breaking of the bread" - took on the coloring of these Messianic Banquets. Perhaps the fish breakfast of John 21:12-13 is the link between the daily meals of Jesus, the eschatological Lord, and the meal-fellowship with the Risen Christ. In this case, the catch of fish no longer represents the people assembled for judgment as in Mk. 1:16-20; Mt. 4:18-22).¹ Rather it represents the means by which the Risen Lord shares in fellowship with the believers, (Lk. 24:42) and becomes their Teacher and Guide. The people are no longer fish to be caught but sheep to be fed, (Jn. 21:15-17).²

Cullmann has done much to bring these materials into focus as materials which influenced the development of the early Eucharist. As we have seen, he modifies Lietzmann's position that Paul himself was the first to connect the eschatological meal with the Last Supper.³ In fact Cullmann

¹ Smith, op. cit., p. 188 remarks that the metaphor of the fishers may be congenial for men but is scarcely so for the fish.
² Ibid., p. 199. The Johannine story has become a parable of missionary enterprise. But I do not see how the metaphor of the people as fish can be retained when Peter says, "I am going fishing." (21:3)n. 23. How can the factor of hate be eliminated from the eschatological expectation unless the pastoral metaphor is substituted?

³ Cullmann, op. cit., p. 18, would agree, however, that Paul first made the connection.

criticizes Lietzmann's failure to show how Paul established the relation between types I and II. He (Cullmann) finds a "very concrete recollection" of the Last Supper already influencing the meal-fellowship in the early church before Paul.¹

The contribution of Cullmann, as I see it, is that he makes the primitive "breaking of bread" among the early Christians bear the weight of his interpretation. In fact all the Gospel passages associated with the primitive Eucharist have a bearing on the Eucharist tradition according to Cullmann. Hence Paul's contribution is understood as formative but not as determinative of the Eucharist:

...St. Paul did not give up the very precious religious ideas attached to the primitive Lord's Supper; he had only deepened them theologically by evoking the recollection of the Last Supper.²

Paul thus achieved a happy mixture of eschatological and memorial elements. But in succeeding developments the new elements which he introduced³ have been emphasized to the detriment of the eschatological and resurrection motifs.⁴

Hence Cullmann calls for a renewal of the eschatological

1

Ibid., p. 7.

2

Ibid., p. 22.

3

Ibid., p. 20 e.g. the new covenant, the remission of sins, (I Cor. 11:23-25), and the Body of Christ, (I Cor. 10:17).

4

Ibid., p. 22. We can certainly agree with Cullmann that there has been "too exclusive an attachment of Christ's presence to the "elements" of bread and wine offered for the remission of sins."

expectation and resurrection gladness in the church where the Eucharist is celebrated and in the liturgies of the church.

"Can we return to the Apostolic Church," he asks. Cullmann's answer is "yes." And he goes on to make the following recommendations on the basis of such a return.

Christians will not rediscover the spirit of the first believers except on condition of assembling for the Lord's Supper in the joyful expectation of eating with Christ while they eat with their brethren, and of recalling once more that the Lord's Supper in the early Church was a feast of the Resurrection. The bold prayer: "Lord come! Maranatha!" ought to assume again the eucharistic reference that it originally had, and it would express the double desire, which was realized for the early Christians, of seeing Christ descend into the midst of the faithful gathered in His name and of discovering for themselves, in that coming, an anticipation of His final Messianic return.¹

This desire to return and to reexperience the eschatological joy is the probable motive behind much of the recent study of the origin of the Eucharist. Certainly the wish to reinterpret traditional liturgical forms in the light of the primitive practices of the early church has long been a dynamic of New Testament studies. Both the purely spiritual and the liturgical emphases are at work in the effort to establish the original context of the Last Supper. This is not to mention, of course, the strictly scientific approach, But the inward appreciation of these findings is the only

¹ Ibid., pp. 22-23.

way that our lives and our Christian worship will be enriched,

I favor Lowrie's judgment that "the breaking of the bread" referred only to the Eucharist when used in the New Testament. This position enriches our conception of the primitive Eucharist since it gives us a number of instances on which to draw, (Ac. 2:42; Ac. 20:7ff, and Ac. 27:33-36, to name but a few). It also brings the Eucharist down to the concrete, the everyday, the practical, not that it eliminates mystery or eschews beauty. But if we see the real setting of the Eucharist as the life of Jesus, we are more apt to see the Lord's Supper as an expression of the totality of his nature and personality. We are more able to appreciate the Eucharistic meaning in his earthly ministry and his resurrection presence as well as that meaning in his passion and death. The themes of common fellowship, eschatological joy, and resurrection gladness will give us new avenues of approach to the Eucharist.

It would be a disservice to drag the Lord's Supper down by emphasizing its commonality. Professor Moule for one has tried to guard the sacredness of the rite by emphasizing its "sacramental" nature as opposed to ordinary nature. But this distinction is, I think, a mistake - or better, only a half truth. The beauty of the Eucharist, and here I follow William Temple, is that it offers the common things back to the Creator. It affirms that God acts through his creation

and indeed has acted through Jesus Christ and participates in these actions. In answer to the question "Is an ordinary meal a Eucharist," I would answer a qualified, "Yes." But I would have great difficulty in defining what I meant by a Eucharist outside traditional terms and forms. For these are the means by which the reality has been apprehended. And while it is true that the Eucharist is a very common, palpable, intimate reality, it is also a great and mysterious drama. Where is the boundary between secularization and profanation? I do not know. But at this point I refer to the warning of St. Paul:

Let a man examine himself, and so eat of the bread and drink of the cup. For any one who eats and drinks without discerning the body eats and drinks judgment upon himself. That is why many of you are weak and ill, and some have died.

I Cor. 11:28-30

The Eucharist is a sacrament of God's New Creation, and therefore all of created existence participates in it. Wee to him who take this potent action lightly! And happy is he who accepts it in his heart.

Chapter Three

The Meaning of the Eucharistic Words in some Modern Liturgies

Now that we have surveyed some of the problems connected with the origin and meaning of the Words of Institution, it is time to see how these materials are being used in some modern liturgies. I do not claim to have made a broad and impartial selection of liturgies. Mostly those which are used are simply the liturgies which lie closest to hand. But those I have chosen represent definite traditions, (see Appendix I). The Divine Liturgy of the Armenian Apostolic Church, of course, represents a distinctive Eastern Orthodox tradition. It contains a wealth of materials not found in the Western rites, and its Anamnesis is an instructive parallel to the Words of Institution in Western liturgies. Since the Roman Mass is closer to The Divine Liturgy than any other Western rite cited, the Sarum Rite has been included as a basis for comparison.

The second group of liturgies are either direct reinterpretations of Anglican liturgies,¹ or they show the strong influence of the Anglican communion. A Liturgy for Africa, 1964, was undertaken at the request of the Archbishops of the Anglican communion in Africa in April, 1961. Its purpose was to "form a bond of unity between Anglicans all over the continent."² This liturgy was meant to serve

¹ e.g. "The Communion Manual", Liturgy Coming to Life, John A.T. Robinson, 1960, used while he was Dean of Clare College Cambridge University.

² A Liturgy for Africa, Introduction, 1964, p. iii.

Anglicans on the continent of Africa. Similarly, The Book of Common Worship of the Church of South India, was proposed to serve churches in a certain geographical district and it credits Anglican churches and service books with direct contributions to its publication.¹ But the liturgy of the Church of South India was by no means created to serve Anglicans - alone. On the contrary, it was proposed to serve a newly united church.

Therefore, in terms of purpose (if not in tradition) The Book of Common Worship is closer to a third group of liturgies, those of the "free churches." The Lord's Day Service of the United Church of Christ for example is also a liturgy of a newly united church. And the Service for the Lord's Day of the Presbyterian Churches is similar in that it was prepared by a Joint Committee on Worship of two separate (though formerly united) churches: the Presbyterian Church in the United States and The United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

Finally there are liturgies which are direct descendants of no particular rite, English or free church but are simply composed by groups of individuals. An Experimental Liturgy edited by Davies, Cope, and Tytler is such a work. It has no authority in any church but is proposed simply in the interests of liturgical advance.

¹ The Book of Common Worship, Acknowledgements, 1963.

If the second group can be traced to the Anglican rites to some extent, an examination of each order should provide a more accurate clue to its place in Anglican liturgical history. In this discussion we are focusing primarily on the Canon of the Mass or Anaphoral Prayer. The Order of Holy Communion used by the former Dean Robinson, of course, follows the Book of Common Prayer of 1662. These are the characteristic features of the 1662 Book in Robinson's order.

- 1) The Order of Holy Communion 1548 precedes the Preface as in the 1662 Book.
- 2) But the Prayer of Humble Access which has become detached from the 1548 Order of Communion now follows the Sanctus in the Preface.
- 3) The Prayer of Consecration has been cut short so that the Anamnesis-Oblation, the Oblation of Worshippers, and the Doxology no longer follow the Institution and Fraction as in the 1548 Order.
- 4) The Lord's Prayer follows the Administration instead of preceding it as in the American Book of Common Prayer of 1928.

The Anglican influence on the liturgy of the Church of South India and the African Liturgy is not traced so easily. But the American Book of Common Prayer comes closer to being the liturgical ancestor to these two liturgies than any other. This is because of the full Consecration Prayer in both the African and Indian liturgies. With the exception

of the Invocation or Epiclesis, which has disappeared completely in the two newer liturgies, all the elements present in the Consecration Prayer of the 1928 Book are present in the corresponding prayers of The Book of Common Worship and A Liturgy for Africa. There has been one relocation: the Fraction has been removed from its place within the Prayer of Consecration and placed just before the Communion. This is also a distinctive feature of the two free church rites. But the latter have omitted the Doxology. It is not my intention to derive all subsequent liturgical reform from the American Prayer Book of 1928, but the Prayer of Consecration in the American Book appears to have been the standard for subsequent Consecration Prayers.

If this is so, it is not without grave reservations among the liturgical reformers some of whom go out of their way to criticize the Anglican rite. In its statement of principal aims, The Lord's Day Service indicates its conviction that "Anglican and Reformed traditions (have) overstressed the introspective and penitential note in piety to the loss of the gladness of the people of God in worship" and its determination to "set forth Christ's victories as being far more significant than our failures." The statement continues:

In the same spirit we wished to make clear that while we commemorate the death of our Lord on the cross in the Lord's Supper, it is the risen and exalted Christ with whom we have communion.¹

¹ The Lord's Day Service, An interpretation, 1964, p. 32.

Is this not the cleavage between the commemorative and the eschatological themes which we have been discussing throughout this paper? That the liturgy of the United Church goes on record in favor of the eschatological theme may show imbalance but if so it is merely in redress of a previous imbalance in the other direction.

It is the expressed purpose of The Lord's Day Service to emphasize the fellowship with the risen Lord through the addition of the Warrant from the Lukan Story of Jesus' Appearance on the Road to Emmaus, (Lk. 24:30-35). The word "Warrant" seems unusual in this connection, but it evidently means a writing which authorizes or justifies the celebration of the Holy Communion, (in this case). "Warrant" then seems to have the same force as the term "Words of Institution" and perhaps the same authority. This is how the Warrant is explained in the liturgy.

The service of Holy Communion finds its warrant not only in the narrative of events in the upper room on the night when our Lord was betrayed, but also in the account of those times when the risen Lord supped with his disciples and was real to them in the breaking of bread.¹

It is instructive to note that the Presbyterian liturgy puts the Words of Institution, (I Cor. 11:23-26 and Lk 24:30) in the same place as the Warrant, i.e. right after the Offering (as well as the traditional place in the Consecration Prayer). The intent seems to be to put the

¹

Ibid., Explanatory Notes, pp. 27-28.

authenticity of the Eucharist beyond question from the outset.

More subtly perhaps it is a confirmation of the doctrine that Sacrament and Word may never be separated. Whereas the Words of Institution in the Book of Common Prayer are a compilation of all four Last Supper accounts, both free church liturgies rely solely on I Cor 11:23-25 and Lk. 24-30 at this point. What the free church words gain in simplicity of reference, I think, they lose in beauty and balance. They certainly do not portray the same and the action as clearly as Cranmer's words. On the other hand, again, perhaps some upsetting of traditional balance and beauty and the serenity and placidity these virtues imply will be necessary before we can realize anew the enlivening power of the Lord's Supper.

The Words of Administration are a third point where the Words of Institution are used in the two free church liturgies, (and a first or second point in all the other liturgies cited). Here, as might be expected, the words from the Synoptics accompanying the bread and cup are used. The Presbyterian liturgy uses the Matthean words; the liturgy of the United Church of Christ uses the Markan. The Synoptic Words are thus not totally neglected but my feeling is that the effect of this use of scripture is too stark and unadorned. This is more than an aesthetic reaction. It goes to the heart of what we mean by Sacrament. If we mean by this something which can be evoked by the power of certain words, i.e. the particular words used by Paul and the Synoptic writers,

then we are approaching the realm of magic. But we can still hold the inseparability of Sacrament and Word if the Word is more than the words contained between the covers of a book called the Bible. When the word is heard as God speaking to us through Christ then perhaps the Sacrament of Holy Communion can be experienced as God's direct action toward us through Christ in the prescribed way. But there is no easy answer. Word and Sacrament must be kept in tension.

Whereas all the Anglican influenced liturgies mentioned follow the Anglican arrangement of the Words of Institution closely, the Words of Administration vary widely: The Experimental Liturgy of Davies, Cope and Tytler and the African Liturgy say simply:

The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ,
which was given for thee. Amen
The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ,
which was shed for thee. Amen

Although Queen Elizabeth has been accused of placating both Catholics and Puritans by including both objective and subjective Words of Administration in the 1559 Prayer Book; nevertheless it is true that by this means "both the objective gift and the subjective attitude...have co-ordinate expression."¹ In the words quoted above, there is only objective expression.

More perhaps can be said for the Words of Administration

¹

Massey H. Shepherd, The Oxford American Prayer Book Commentary, pp. 82-83, 1950.

in The Book of Common Worship:

The body of our Lord Jesus Christ,
the Bread of life.
The blood of our Lord Jesus Christ,
the true vine.

Even if these are admittedly objective words, they refer to the Eucharistic commentary of John 6, thus broadening the Scriptural base of the Lord's Supper.

In conclusion, I would point out two principles of liturgical renewal which in light of my present understanding, seem most reasonable to me. The first is taken from the Reverend Louis Bouyer in Liturgical Piety, (p. 62), where the author describes the "true realism" of "always going to work with the actual liturgy of the church of today." This means that we do not need innovation for innovation's sake. It also means that we cannot go back to the church as it was in the first and second centuries. Sometimes it is assumed that the primitive church itself had no liturgical tradition, but this is a mistake. Thus it is wrong, I feel, to strip away all tradition in favor of some imaginary simplicity which never actually existed. This would be my major criticism of the two free church liturgies here briefly examined. It seems as though a more careful examination of our present liturgies, starting with more careful reading and meditation would yield its own measure of renewal.

My second point relates to this thesis as a whole. It is that the liturgy needs a broader scriptural base. The Word of God may not be confined by the covers of the Bible,

but it certainly is present there. I have sought to show that it is particularly at work in the Words of Institution and in the passages related to the Feeding of the Multitudes, the Breaking of Bread, and the post resurrection appearances. At this point I cannot commend too highly the free church liturgies which we have discussed for making such appropriate use of Luke 24:30-35. But I would like~~to~~ to see this fuller use of the Scriptures extended to the whole liturgy so that the fullness of our Lord's personality and the greater meaning of his actions could be made available for the common worshipper.

Appendix I

Some Modern Orders of Worship

The Divine Liturgy of the Armenian Apostolic Church
Jerusalem, 1958

Preparation

Synaxis

The Holy Sacrifice

Offertory

Great Entrance

Dismissal of Catechumens

Hymn of the Great Entrance

The Bidding of the Hagiody

The Responsory before the Cherubicon

The Cherubicon

The Responsory of the Great Entrance

Laying of the Gifts

The Litany of the Offertory

Kiss of Peace

The Greeting

The Bidding of the Kiss of Peace

Hymn of the Kiss of Peace

The Eucharistia

Prologue

Responsory of the Prologue

Responsory of the Eucharist

Sursum Corda

Preface

Hymn of the Preface

Anamnesis

Sanctus // Anamnesis

Hymn to the Father

Hymn of Blessing // Prayer of Humble Access

Epiclesis

Hymn to the Son

Diptychs

Hymn to the Holy Spirit // General Intercessions

Litany of General Intercessions

Litany of Special Intercessions // the Special Inter-
cessions

The Lord's Prayer

Dominical Prayer // Embolis

Inclination and Elevation

Hymn of Elevation // Prayer of Elevation

Doxology

Intinction and Fraction

Intinction

Fraction

The Communion

Ante-Communion Prayers

The Tasting

The Prayer of Tasting

The Bidding to Communicants

The Prayer after Communion

Thanksgiving

The Last Blessing and Dismissal

The Next Three Orders were prepared by Professor
C. W. F. Smith for P.T. 128, Liturgics in the Spring
Semester of 1965:

The Order of the Sarum Rite

The Order of the English Prayer Books of
1552-1662

The Order of the American Prayer Book of
1928

The Order of the Sarum Rite

Te igitur - offering of elements in sacrifice for the Church

Memento - Commemoration of Living

Communicantes - Commemoration of the saints

Hanc Igitur - oblation of service

Quam oblationem - blessing of B and W

Qui pridie

and Simile Modo - Recital of Institution. (with elevation)

Unde et memores - Anamnesis

Supra quae propitio - Oblation

Memento - memorial of the dead

Doxology

Lord's Prayer and Embolismus

Fraction

Pax Domini

Agnus Dei

Commixture

Collect for Peace of Church

Priest's preparation for reception

Giving of the Peace

Three secret collects

Adoration and reception

Priest's thanksgiving

Ablution

Post-communion collects

The Dismissal

Private devotions of Priest

Reading of Gospel of John

The Order of the English Prayer
Books of 1552-1662

Prayer for the whole state
of Christ's Church

The Order for the H.C. (1548)

(Exhortation 1.) (Eng.3)
Invitation
General Confession
General Absolution
Comfortable Words

The Preface

Sursum Corda
Preface
- Proper Preface
Ter Sanctus
Prayer of Humble Access

Prayer of Consecration

Memorial of Passion
P. for reception of Body
and Blood
Recital of Institution
(with Fraction)

Administration to clergy and
people

Lord's Prayer

Thanksgiving or Thanksgiving
Oblation

Gloria in Excelsis

Peace and Benediction

Ablutions

The Order of the American
Prayer Book of 1928

(Bidding of secret intercession)

Prayer for the whole state
of Christ's Church

The Order for the H.C.

(Exhortation 1.) x3 required
Invitation
General Confession
General Absolution
Comfortable Words

The Preface

Sursum Corda
Preface
- Proper Preface
Ter Sanctus

Prayer of Consecration

Memorial of Passion

Recital of Institution
(with Fraction)
Anamnesis Oblation
Invocation
Oblation of Worshippers
Doxology
Lord's Prayer with Bidding

Prayer of Humble Access
(Hymn)

Administration to clergy and people

Thanksgiving

Gloria in Excelsis or hymn

Peace and Benediction

Ablutions

An Experimental Liturgy
ed., J. B. Davies, G. F. Cope,
D. A. Tytler, 1958.

"The Communion Manual" from
Liturgy Coming to Life, John
A. T. Robinson, 1960, used at
Clare College, Cambridge
University while John A. T.
Robinson was Dean (1951-1959)

The Ministry of the
Sacrament

The Breaking of the Bread

Offertory

The First Action: taking
Offertory Sentences (from
the words of the Pax)

The Peace

Exhortation

Bringing of Gifts

Taking of Gifts

Hymn

Offertory Prayer

Preparation

Biddings

Prayer for the Whole

State of Christ's Church

Invitation

Confession

Absolution

The Gracious Words

Thanksgiving
Sursum Corda

The Second Action: Blessing
Sursum Corda
Preface

Proper Preface

Ter Sanctus

Prayer of Humble Access

Ter Sanctus

~~The~~ Memorial of Passion

Memorial of Passion

Institution

Fraction (I Cor. 10:16)

Anamnesis

Oblation of Elements

Doxology and

congregational response

Lord's Prayer with bidding

Fraction with sentence and
response

Silence

Prayer of Humble Access
(optional)

The Communion

Administration to

Celebrant and assisting
Clergy

Invitation and Response

Administration to People

The Fourth Action: Sharing
The Communion of clergy
and people

Sentence of Invitation

Prayer of Thanksgiving

Lord's Prayer

Oblation

Thanksgiving

Gloria in Excelsis

Blessing

Hymn

Dismissal

The Lord's Day Service
United Church of Christ
1964

Offering
Warrant Lk. 24:30-35

Invitation
Pax
Sursum Corda
Preface
Sanctus

Narrative of Institution
Anamnesis
Epiclesis
Oblation (I Pe. 2:9)

Fraction and Libation
(according to the words
of Institution)

Distribution
(Words of distribution
are Words of Institution)

Post-Communion prayer
(Thanksgiving)
Concluding Hymn
Charge to the people
(Dismissal)
Benediction

Service for the Lord's Day
Presbyterian Church - Joint
Committee of PCUS & UPCUSA
1964

Invitation
Offering
Words of Institution I Cor. 11:23-26
Lk. 24:30

Pax
Sursum Corda
Preface
Sanctus
Memorial (of Jesus' life)
Institution
Anamnesis
Invocation
Oblation (prayer together)
Lord's Prayer
Fraction and Libation
(Markan words of Institution)

Distribution with grace

"Bless the Lord, O my Soul"
Prayer for grace
Prayer for thy servants departed
Hymn or Nunc Dimmittis
General Thanksgiving

Charge to People
Dismissal
Grace

The Book of Common Worship
The Church of South India
1963

The Breaking of the Bread

Responses

The Peace (Optional)

Bringing of Gifts

Prayer of Acceptance

Sursum Corda

Preface

Ter Sanctus

Memorial of Passion

Institution and

Response

Anamnesis and Response

Oblation of Elements

Doxology

Lord's Prayer with
Bidding

Silence

Prayer of Humble Access

Fraction

(with optional sentences)

Administration to Clergy
and People

Agnus Dei

Prayer of Thanksgiving
with Bidding and
Response

Second Benediction

Hymn (optional)

A Liturgy for Africa - 1964
drafted at Kampala in 1963
by representatives of the
Provinces of South Africa,
West Africa, Central Africa,
East Africa, Uganda. Amended
by the Liturgical Consultation
of the Anglican Communion at
Toronto, August, 1963.

The Service of the Lord's Supper

The Peace

The Placing of the Gifts

The Great Thanksgiving

Sursum Corda

Preface

Ter Sanctus

Memorial of Passion (abbreviated)

Invocation (without Holy Spirit)

Institution

Oblation of Worshippers

Doxology

Lord's Prayer with bidding

The Breaking of the Bread
(Fraction I Cor. 10:16)

The Communion
reception of priest
invitation (abbreviated)
sentences of administration
(abbreviated)

The Dismissal
Versicles and responses
Gloria or some other hymn
Responses

Bibliography

Primary Sources:

The Book of Common Worship, of the Church of South India,
as authorized by the Synod, 1962, Oxford University
Press, London, 1963.

"The Communion Manual", used at Clare College, Cambridge
University, 1951-1959 while John A. T. Robinson was
Dean. Taken from Robinson, J.A.T., Liturgy Coming to
Life, The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1964.

Divine Liturgy, of the Armenian Apostolic Church, Armenian
Printing Press, Jerusalem, Jordan, 1958.

An Experimental Liturgy, ed. Davies, J.G., Cope, G.F, and
Tytler, D.A., Ecumenical Studies in Worship Series no. 3,
John Knox Press, Richmond, Virginia, 1958.

Gospel Parallels, ed. Throkmorton, B.H. Jr., Thomas Nelson
and Sons, New York, 1961.

Haggadah of Passover, trans. Samuel, Maurice, Hebrew Publishing
Company, New York, 1942.

The Holy Bible, Revised Standard Version, Thomas Nelson and
Sons, New York, 1953.

A Liturgy for Africa, S.P.C.K., London, 1964.

The Lord's Day Service, United Church of Christ Press, Boston,
1964.

The Mishnah, ed. Danby, H., at the Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1933.

Novum Testamentum Graec^s, ed. Nettle, E., Wurttembergische
Bibelanstalt, Stuttgart, Germany, 1963.

Service for the Lord's Day, The Westminster Press, Philadelphia
1964.

Synopse Der Drei Ersten Evangelien, ed. Huck, A. and Lietzmann,
H, Verlag Von J.C.B. Mohr, (Paul Siebeck), Tübingen, 1950.

Bibliography - cont.

Secondary Sources:

- Barrett, C. K., The New Testament Background, First Published by S.P.C.K. London, 1956. First Harper Torchbook edition by Harper and Brothers, New York, 1961.
- Bauer, W., A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, trans. and ed. Arndt, W.F. and Gingrich, F. W., University of Chicago Press, Chicago. The Syndics of the Cambridge University Press, London, 1957.
- Bouyer, Louis, Liturgical Piety, Liturgical Studies Series, Vol. I, University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame, Indiana, 1954.
- Bultmann, R., The History of the Synoptic Tradition, Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1963.
- Cullmann, O., "The Meaning of the Lord's Supper in Primitive Christianity", Essays on the Lord's Supper, ed. Davies, J.G., Ecumenical Studies in Worship, No. 1, John Knox Press, Richmond, Virginia, 1958.
- Dalman, G., Jesus-Jeshua, S.P.C.K., London, 1929.
- Idelsohn, A. Z., Jewish Liturgy, Henry Holt and Company, New York, 1932.
- Jeremias, J., The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1955.
- Kittel, G., Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, trans. and ed., Bromiley, G. W., Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan, vol. II, 1964.
- Kuhn, K. G., "The Lord's Supper and the Communal Meal At Qumran," The Scrolls and the New Testament, ed. Stendahl, K., pp. 65-93.
- Lietzmann, H., Mass and Lord's Supper, Fascicles 1-6, E.J. Brill, Leiden, Holland, 1953.
- Lowrie, W., The Lord's Supper and the Liturgy, Longmans, Green and Co., New York, 1943.
- Moule, C.D.F., Worship in the New Testament, Ecumenical Studies in Worship, No. 9, John Knox Press, Richmond, Virginia, 1961.

Bibliography - cont.

Shepherd, M.H., Jr., The Oxford American Prayer Book Commentary,
Oxford University Press, New York, 1950.

Smith, C. W. F., "Action in the Liturgy", Dr. Lowrie of
Princeton and Rome, ed. Zabriskie, A.C., The Seabury
Press, Greenwich Connecticut, 1957.

_____, "Fishers of Men", The Harvard Theological
Review, Vol. LII, No. 3, July, 1959.

Taylor, V., The Gospel According to St. Mark, The Macmillan
Company, London, 1952.